

THE
Last Legacy 10
OF
HENRY CARE, Gent.

Lately Deceased.

Containing A

Brief SUM OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE,

By Way of

QUESTION and ANSWER.

Particularly relating to Several of the most
IMPORTANT POINTS controverted be-
tween US, and the ROMANISTS.

Decided by express Testimonies of the *Holy Scripture*,
and evident Reason.

*Published for the use of such as are unable to Purchase, or
comprehend Larger and more Elaborate Tracts.*

*Be ready always to give an account to every man that asketh a
reason of the hope that is in you, with meekness and fear,
1 Pet. 3. 15.*

L O N D O N:

Printed for Tho. Cockerill at the Three Legs in the
Poultry, 1688. D 171 (10)



TO THE
READER.

IT was the Judgment of the great *St. Augustine*, That in places endangered with *Heresy*, all Men should write that had any Faculty therein, tho it were but the same things in other Words; That all sorts of People, amongst many Books, might light upon some suitable to their Capacities, and the Enemy in all places find one or other to oppose him. Whilst therefore our more Learned Divines, with a most Praise-worthy diligence, by their Larger and more Accurate Discourses, defend the Truths of God, that is, the Protestant Religion; These plain Papers may possibly prove not altogether unuseful to the meaner sort of People, who are in most danger of being betray'd into Error, and have neither Ability to purchase, nor Time to read, nor Capacities to apprehend more Sublime and Scholastical Disputes.

My Aim is no other than to Represent Christianity in its Native, Innocent Dress, and to strengthen weak Souls, by reminding them of some evident Scripture-Proofs of that Religion they profess, that so they may not be shaken from
A 2 their

To the Reader.

their most Holy Faith, by the *Sophistry* of an insinuating Pretensions. In order to render thus effectual, I have chiefly made use of the *Sacred Text*, tho not altogether omitting the Testimonies of the *Ancients*; especially in the Questions touching the *Scriptures* and *Traditions* where the same seemed most Requisite, and the only beg of Thee (Christian Reader!) That lay aside all *Prejudices*, and the *false Bias* of worldly Interest, thou wouldst peruse these few Lines seriously, as treating of matters of the highest Moment, and importing no less than thy *Eternal Welfare*; and that thou wouldst be willing to submit thy Soul and Conscience to the clear and obvious Sense of *Holy Scripture*. And then, tho the *Brevity* I design, allowed not room, particularly to Answer all the *little Objections* that may be made; yet I am apt to hope thou wilt (by Gods Grace) find *sufficient Cause* to hold fast the *Reformed Religion*, and not to be altogether unfurnisht of a competent *Defence* against any material Attacques.

THE

THE CONTENTS.

T HE Old and New Testament is the only Rule to direct us, how we may know and serve God acceptably.	Page 1
The Difference between the Tradition by which we have received the Holy Scriptures from the times of the Apostles, and the Oral Traditions intruded by the Roman Church, which are contrary to the Scripture.	3
An Exposition of that Text, 2 Thess. 2. 15. Hold fast the Traditions you have been taught either by word or our Epistle.	6
The Opinion of the Ancient Fathers about Tradition.	7
Reasons for the use of the Books commonly called Apocrypha.	8
The Authority of the Scripture prov'd not to depend on the Authority of the Church.	10
People of all Ranks and Qualities ought to hear and read the Holy Scriptures; and therefore the Translating it into the Vulgar Tongue absolutely necessary.	12, 13
The Unjustness and Uncharitableness of the Roman Church in denying the benefit of the Scriptures to the Common People.	14
The Plainness and Clearness of the Holy Scriptures proved, and the Roman Objections answered.	15
One only God to be worshipp'd in Three Persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.	17
	The

The CONTENTS.

The Transgression of Adam, and the Corruptions of Man's Nature thereby.

No Sins so small as deserve not the Wrath of God; yet there are great differences in the degrees of Sin.

God's Mercy and Justice in sending his Son Jesus Christ our Redeemer.

By what means we are made Partakers of Christ and his Benefits.

What is meant by the Catholic Church in the Creed, The Church of Rome proved a Particular Church, and not the only Catholic Church.

St. Peter not Prince of the Apostles, they had all equal Power.

The uncertainty of St. Peter's being ever Bishop of Rome.

Jesus Christ proved to be the only Head of the Church, the Pope not Christ's Vicar on Earth.

The Church not free from Errors, therefore not infallible; nor can the Romans agree where their pretended Infallibility is lodged.

What is meant by Faith and Justification.

The Romish Doctrine of Justification considered.

Whether in this Life we can perfectly fulfil the Law of God, and whether any Person (our Saviour excepted) can perfectly keep all the Commandments?

The Doctrine of the Roman Church, touching Merits, considered.

It is our Duty with all diligence to practise and press on to Holiness, and Righteousness, and the study of Good Works.

The meaning of Works of Supererogation, where it is proved there cannot be any such Works.

How we are to understand those words of the First Commandment, Thou shalt have no other Gods before me?

The CONTENTS.

Prayer is an Act of Religious Worship, and therefore not to be given to Angels, or Saints departed.	48
Invocation of Saints branded with Idolatry by the Council of Laodicea, and contrary to the Opinion of the Fathers.	52
Images in Divine Worship and Religious use, contrary to the Second Commandment.	53
The Romanists leave out the Second Commandment in several of their Catechisms, and divide the Tenth into two, to make up the Number.	54
The Design of this foul Practice in the Church of Rome.	55
God's Glorious and Incomprehensible Nature cannot be represented by an Image, but in a way of infinite disparagement to him.	57
The Romanists do not only worship Images, but are commanded so to do by some of their Councils.	58
That Prayer is; the using Prayers in an Unknown Tongue is a Profanation of that Religious Duty.	60
Prayers for the Dead proved unlawful.	61
The Doctrine of Purgatory built on the Sand, and invented for secular ends.	62
Indulgences are the Moral to the Fable of Purgatory.	64
The Doctrine of Merits consider'd; the Wise Virgins' bad Oil little enough for themselves.	65
There are but two Sacraments, Baptism, and the Lords Supper, of the New Testament.	66
The five other Sacraments of the Roman Church, viz. Confirmation, Penance, Matrimony, Orders, and Extream Unction, not justified by Scripture.	67
The Efficacy of Sacraments depend not on the Intention of the Minister, but upon the Sacrament.	68
The Sacraments confer Grace, not by the Sacramental Action, but by the Power and Operation of the Spirit.	69
Transubstantiation repugnant to Scripture as well as Sense, and weakens the Credibility of the Christian Religion.	70
	The

THE CONTENTS.

*The beginning of that Doctrine founded on the Error of
Worship.*

The Explanation of those words, This is my Body.

The Absurdities of the Doctrine of Transubstantiation.

*The Roman Doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass contrary
to the Scripture.*

*The forbidding the Cup to the Common People directly
to Christ's Institution.*

*The Usurpation and Corruptions of the Church of Rome
sufficiently proved.*

Brief Sum of Christian Doctrine,

By Way of

QUESTION and ANSWER.

Question.

WH O is it that Created you, and placed you in this world?

A. *God.*

Q. To what End?

A. To know, love and serve him, and by such means as he hath appointed, to attain to everlasting life.

Q. What Rule have you to direct you, how you may know, love, and acceptably serve God?

A. The Word of God, or Divinely-inspired Scriptures (containing the Old and New Testament) is the only Rule to direct us, how we may know, and serve him acceptably, *Isa. 8. 20. To the Law, and to the Testimony, if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them. Joh. 5. 39. Search the Scriptures, they are they that testify of me. 2 Tim. 3. 15. From a child thou hast known the Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation, through Faith which is in Christ Jesus: All Scripture is given by Inspiration, and is profitable for DOCTRINE, for REPROOF, for CORRECTION, for INSTRUCTION in Righteousness: That the man of God may be PERFECT, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.*

B

Q. Is

Q. Is this Rule of it self, sufficient, and perfect?

A. Yes: *Psal. 19. 7. The Law of God is perfect, converting the soul. The Apostle (you heard but now) affirms that the Scriptures are able to make us wise unto salvation. And again, Rom. 15. 4. Whatsoever things were written aforetime, were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort, of the Scriptures, might have hope. They were dictated by the Holy Ghost for that very purpose, 20. 31. These things are written, that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing, you might have life through his name. And to say the Scriptures inspired by God, are Defective, or not sufficient for the End for which he designed them, is not short of Blasphemy; therefore the Scripture is called, a Testament, the chief property of which is, to declare the whole will of the Testator; and Canonical, because they are the Canon, that is the Rule, the Square of Religion, Faith, and Piety. Gal. 6. 16.*

Q. How came you by these Scriptures, which you call are your Rule?

A. The Divine Truths were first Delivered and Preached by word of mouth; but Almighty God, in his infinite Wisdom and Goodness, seeing it most advantageous for his own Glory, and the good of men, for preventing manifold Inconveniencies, and that they might have a standing Law whereunto to resort, did think fit to have the same afterwards committed to writing, by persons Divinely Inspired; the *Old Testament*, at diverse times, as he saw best, for the Edification of his Church; and the *New Testament*, all within few years after the Promulgation of the Gospel by our Saviour.

Which Sacred Writings he has continually preserved by his Signal Providence, and the Ministry of his Church; and they are brought down to us by an *Universal uninterrupted Tradition*, that is, received and delivered on, and witnessed unto, as such, by the concurring Testimony

of all *Christian Churches*, in all Ages, from the Apostles times to this day.

Q. If you receive the Scriptures themselves by *Tradition*, why may you not receive other *Traditions* likewise, with equal veneration, as *part of your Rule*?

A. The word *Tradition* is used in a double sense; sometimes as it signifies the *Delivery* of a thing, and sometimes as it denotes the *thing delivered*. That Universal Tradition whereby we receive the Scriptures, is no part of *Doctrine delivered*, but only the *Instrument*, or means of conveying that Doctrine, and therefore tho necessary to bring the Rule to us, is yet no part of our Rule; as the *water* of a remote, but excellent *Fountain*, which quencheth my thirst, could not come to me, if there were not a *channel* to convey it, yet it is the *water alone* that refresheth me, not the Channel: Therefore if by *Traditions* (taking the word in the latter signification) be understood any matters of *Faith* or *Practise* imposed as *necessary to Salvation*, not comprehended in the Holy Scriptures, nor capable of full proof from them, but said to be otherwise derived from the Apostles by *Tradition*, (that is, either by word of mouth, or in the Writings of fallible men) we think our selves not bound to receive the same. Because,

1. That *Universal Tradition* which handed down to us the Scriptures as the undoubted *Word of God*, has likewise always attested the same to be our *only Rule*, for the knowledg of God's will, and our Duty: By them the Primitive Christians try'd all *Doctrines*, by them they proved their *Faith*, by them they squar'd their *Lives*, by them they confuted *Heretic*; thus *Irenaeus* (who flourisht about the year of our Lord 180) in his Third Book, chap. 46. saith, *That to lean on the Scriptures of God (which are the certain and undoubted Truth) is to build upon a sure and strong Rock; but to quit That, and depend on any other Doctrines whatsoever they be, is to build a ruinous house on the sand, or shattering Gravel, whereof the overthrow is easie.* Tertullian

(that lived a little after) agrees herein, calling the Scriptures, *The Rule of Faith*, (*Tert. cont. Hermog.*) *St. Cyprian* (*Hon. 3. in 2 Cor.*) tells us, *That they are a requisite Rule, and an exact Square, and Ballance, to try all by* *St. Augustine* [*De Bon. Viduit. cap. 1.*] testifies, *The Holy Scripture hath fixed the Rule of our Doctrine, that we not presume to be more wise than we ought.* And *St. Jerome* [*in Matth. Lib. 1. Cap. 1.*] owns, *That the Holy Scriptures are the Limits of the Church, out of [or beyond] which we may not go:* Abundance of like Testimonies might be brought from the most eminent Doctors in the last Ages since, too tedious here to recite.

2ly, Because the Scriptures themselves (which be the Word of the God of Truth, cannot deceive us) testify of their own perfection and sufficiency, as appear the Texts quoted in Answer to the former Question, and are so far from intimating, That there is any suppletory Rule necessary for us to be acquainted with, informing us where we should find, or how we should know it, that they declare the contrary, requiring us not to think above what is written, *1 Cor. 4. 6. What things I command you, observe to do it, Thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it, Deut. 12. 32. If any man shall add unto these things (saith St. John, who clos'd the Sacred Canon) God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this Book, Rev. 22. 18. Why do you transgress the Commandments of God by your Traditions? Matth. 15. 3. In vain do they worship me, teaching for Doctrine the Commandments of men, We have a more sure word of Prophecy, wherunto you desire to take heed, as to a light shining in a dark place, 2 Pet. 1. Walk not in the statutes of your forefathers, neither observe their judgments, nor defile your selves with their Idols, I am the Lord your God, walk in my Statutes, and keep my Judgments, and do them, Ezek. 20. 18. If ye be dead with Christ, the Rudiments of the world, why are you subject to Ordinances (touch not, taste not, &c.) after the Commandments and Do-*

man, which things indeed have a shew of wisdom, in wisdom, and humility, and neglecting the Body? 2 Coloss, 12.

35, Because as *Oral Tradition* is in its own nature most liable to be falsified, and mistaken; so the advancing of unwritten Traditions against, or besides the Scriptures, has always actually been of dangerous consequence. To prevent which, seems a main cause why the Divine Wisdom commanded his Truths to writing. Was it not Tradition by which the Scribes and Pharisees diminished the Integrity of the Law, and corrupted the meaning thereof? *Matth. 5. 18.* Was it not a pretended Apostolical word which first troubled the Church of Antioch, which the Apostles assembled at Jerusalem, confuted by their Epistle? *Acts 15.* And so they had a written Word to strengthen them against that counterfeit Tradition. How much the Churches were troubled with several Errors pretended to be received by Tradition from this or that Apostle, or some of their Hearers, is evident in Ecclesiastical History, some of which Traditions were presently rejected, others for some time almost generally embraced, but afterwards found to be impostures.

4thly, Because those things obtruded by the Church of Rome as Apostolical Traditions (at least most of them) are not only besides, but contrary to Scripture; so that if they were true, the Scripture must be not only deficient, but false, and the Apostles contrary to themselves. Nor were they known, allowed, or practised by the Primitive Churches, many of them not heard of for many Ages after, none of them ever embraced by the Universal Church; so that they are far from being what they pretend to, *Catholic*. And therefore, tho' the Fathers at Trent require us on point of Anathema, to receive their Traditions with equal reverence as we do the Holy Scripture, we dare not do so till we find them confirmed with the same, or equal Authority: And the rather, because most of them tend

not to the glory of God, or good of Souls; but only to the *honour*, or *profit* of those Persons that advance them; and are too apt to draw away mens hearts from *solid Faith*, and *Piety*, to fix them on external superficial Performances, and to put their trust in *Creatures*, instead of the Adorable Creator.

Q. Doth not the Apostle, 2 *Thess.* 2. 15. say, *Hold fast the Traditions which you have been taught, either by word, or our Epistle?*

A. Yes; But if the Gentlemen of the *Roman Communion* would impartially read the foregoing Verses, I think they would have small reason to vouch this Text for justifying their *unscriptural Traditions*: St. Paul has been there giving a Prophetical Description of that grand *Apostacy*, the *Man of Sin*, and *Mystery of Iniquity*, which in after-times should over-run the Church; (And he does it in such *graphical Characters*, and lively Colours, that as one said *wittily*, There never appeared any so fit to be apprehended and charged, on such an *Hue and Cry*, as the *Popes of Rome*.) To prevent Christians from being seduced by this *Deceivableness of unrighteousness*, the Apostle admonishes them, To hold fast the *Traditions*, that is, the *Fundamentals of Christianity*, which he had taught them, either by *word of mouth*, or *Epistle*; For it appears by the word, *Therefore*, in the beginning of this Verse, that the same is an *Inference* from the Discourse foregoing, where he had been treating of the grand Doctrines of the Gospel, *Election*, *Faith in Jesus*, *Sanctification* by the Spirit, and the *Belief of the Truth*, v. 13, and 14. all which are plainly taught us in *Scripture*. And tho there might be some things which he had not expressly written to them of in particular, as having now no occasion to repeat all in *writing*, which he had formerly preached unto them; yet it follows not but the same were written by him, or others of the inspired Pen-men, before or after. The strength of the Objection is no more than this, All things necessary

necessary to Salvation are not contained in the *First or Second Epistle to the Thessalonians*, therefore not in the *whole Book of God*. Because St. Paul delivered to them some Doctrines by *word of mouth*, therefore neither he elsewhere, nor any other Apostle, recorded them, but they remain to this day *unwritten*: which is a ridiculous inconclusive Argument. Besides, how can they tell what these Traditions were, if no-where written? or how will they make it appear, that these Traditions, not written, yet taught by St. Paul to the *Thessalonians*, are the same, or any of those Traditions which they would now obtrude upon the Church?

Q. But do not *Ancient Fathers* frequently mention and urge Tradition?

A. Yes; But by that word, they understand, *First*, Oftentimes the Doctrine of Christianity expressly delivered in Scripture, as St. Cyprian, when he says, *If either it be commanded in the Gospel, or contained in the Epistles, or Acts of the Apostles, let this holy Tradition certainly be observed.* [Cyprian, ad Pomp.]

Secondly, Sometimes by *unwritten Traditions*, they mean no more than such things which are not in *express* words found in the Scripture, but yet are contained therein, and deducible thence by right and just consequence: Thus for Example; They call the *baptizing* of Christians Children a Tradition; but yet still they omit not to prove the same by Scripture. And therefore when Irenaeus speaks of Traditions, he saith they were, *κατά τὴν ἀποστολικὴν καὶ κυριακὴν παράδοσιν*, *agreeable to the Scriptures.*

Thirdly, By Traditions sometimes they intend only certain *indifferent Rites, Ceremonies or Observances*; And thus St. Jerome says, *Every Province abounds in its own sense, and thinks the Precepts of their Ancestors Apostolical Laws.* [Hier. ad Lucium.]

Fourthly, Some of them sometimes by mistake, mention under the name of *Apostolical Traditions*, matters which

were not so; As that *Infants* should receive the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; That Christ should reign on Earth a thousand years; the first of which is now wholly rejected by Christians; the other maintained but by very few, and that too, not on the account of *Tradition*, but grounded (as they fancy) on some Texts of Scripture.

Fifthly, Sometimes the *Fathers* having to do with *Heretics* that excepted against the Scriptures, or cavill'd at them as defective without Tradition; do by way of Argument *ad hominem*, appeal unto, and press them with the *universal Tradition of the Church*, not thereby to advance any Doctrines which were not sufficiently provable by Scriptures, but only to stop the mouths of Gain-sayers by the same *medium* which themselves so much pretended to.

To one of these five Heads all Testimonies which the *Romanists* can produce out of the *Fathers* are reducible, and so make nothing for their *Traditions of Faith*, besides, or contrary to Scripture: For so far were the *Fathers* from maintaining such, that by Scripture they opposed and overthrew them, as St. *Hierom* teaches us. — As for those things (saith he) which without the Authority and Testimonies of Scripture, they (*viz.* any Heretics) feign and hold of their own accord, as by Apostolical Tradition; the Sword of God (that is his Word) cuts them in pieces; Hier. in Haggzum, Cap. 1.

And I have the longer insisted heron, because this Fort of *Traditions* seems to be one of the main Posts of Popery.

Q. What say you concerning the Books commonly call'd *Apocrypha*?

A. The Church (publicly as well as privately) reads some parts of them, for Example of Life, and Instruction of Manners; but it doth not acknowledg them to be Divinely inspired, so as thereon to establish any *Articles of Faith*.

Q. For what Reasons?

A. Because, *First*, They were not received as *Divine* by the *Jewish Church* (to whom were committed the *Oracles of God*, Rom. 3. 2.) Now if they had rejected any part of the *Canon of the Old Testament*, Christ, who for ten taxes them for *misinterpreting* Scriptures, and *preaching* their own *Traditions*, would no doubt, for this, much more have reproved them.

Secondly, Because all the *Canonical Books of the Old Testament* were written by *Prophets*, and in the *Tongue* used by *Prophets*, viz. *Hebrew*, or *Chaldee*, and do bear witness to *Christ*, and were accordingly made use of by him, and his *Apostles*. But such are not these *Apocryphal Books*; for all agree, That *Malachy* was the last of the *Prophets*, and that then began the *sealing of Prophecy*, as the *Jews* call it. Now that some of these *Books* were written after his time, plainly appears by *Ecclesiasticus* and the *Maccabees*. And for the other, that bear the names of *Prophets*, there is no certainty that they were wrote by those to whom they are attributed; nor are any of them written in *Hebrew*, or *Chaldee*, (then the *Jews* vulgar *Tongue*) but in *Greek*; nor does our *Lord*, or his *Apostles* (tho in the *New Testament* they cite above 120 distinct *Texts* out of the *Old*) once cite any of them, or make use of their *Testimony* as *Prophetical*: For if (as some suppose) there be in one or two places an allusion to some of their *Expressions*, yet will that no more prove them *Canonical*, unless they had been referred to as *such*, than it does the *Works of Aratus, Menander, and Epimenides* (three *Heathen Poets*) that from each of them a *Sentence* is occasionally mention'd in *Holy Writ*; (The first, *Acts* 17. 28. the second, *1 Cor.* 15. 33. and the third, *Tit.* 1. 12.)

Thirdly, These *Books* contain some things false, *superstitious*, and *contradictory* both to the *Canonical Scriptures*, and themselves; as will appear, by comparing what is said, in

in *Judith* 9. 2. with *Gen.* 34. 30. and 49. 6. or the *Baruch* 1. 1. with *Jeremy* 43. 6. or 1 *Macc.* 6. 8. with the 2 *Macc.* 1. 13. Or both these last places, with the 9th Chapter of the same 2d Book of *Macc.* v. 21. the Apocryphal *Esther*, *Ch.* 11. 12. with the Canon *Esther* 2. 16. And *Chap.* 12. 5. of the Apocryphal, *Chap.* 6. 3. of the true *Esther*; so *Tobit* 5. 12. the Angel maketh a Lye; and the 2 *Macc.* 14. 42. commendeth *Self-murder*; and *Chap.* 12. 45. Sacrifice for the Dead, even those that dyed in *Idolatry*.

Fourthly, Because (for all the aforesaid Reasons, and many others) these Books were not received into the Canon by the *Primitive Church*, as the Ancient Fathers plainly testify; and therefore they have been always call'd doubtful Authority; nor were the same ever imposed by any *General Council*, (for that call'd the 3d of *Carthage* about the year 400. was only *Provincial*, nor are all the Canons, particularly the 26th, received by the *Romans* themselves) until the last Age in that pretended one of *Trent*, 1546 years after our Lords Incarnation, at which time there were not in all of those that had *Votes*, above fifty Persons, or thereabouts present, and the far greater part of them *Italians*; and all the Popes Creatures; and thin Representative of the Universal Church throughout the whole World.

Q. But doth the Authority of Scripture depend on the Testimony of the Church?

A. No; for that were to make the words of the Master to receive their Authority from the Servant. A Father's Letters to derive the Credit with his Son, merely from the Post that brings them; and the Rule to have dependance on the thing Ruled; nor should we by the Medium, be able to prove the Scriptures to be Gods Word against an *Atheist*, or *Heathen*, with whom the Authority of the Church signifies little; nor indeed should we ever know that there were any Church at all, or a

ask, what Authority it has, but by the *Scriptures*; which are not therefore of Divine Authority, because the *Church* declares them so to be, but the *Church* hath declared them so, because it *knew* them to be of such Authority.

Q. Is then the Testimony of the Church of no force?

A. The Voice or Attestation of the *Universal Church* is a Ministerial Testimony, which ought reverently to be regarded, as that which is profitable to prepare the heart, and by raising an Historical Faith, makes room for that which is Divine; whence the Church is called the *Pillar and Ground of Truth*, 1 Tim. 3. 15. But still the Kings Proclamation receives not its Authority from the *Pillar* on which it is affixed, nor the *Candle* its light from the *Candlestick* that supports or holds it forth.

The Churches Testimony is *inviting*, and may, and ought to be prevalent with those who as yet know not the *Scriptures*, and have not received the sincere *Milk of the Word*, 1 Pet. 2. 2. In which Sense, that famous saying of St. *Augustin*, is to be understood, *I had not known the Scriptures, had not the Church told me which were the Scriptures*. But in those who have tasted the sweetness of this *Cœlestial Manna*, the Testimony of the *Scriptures* themselves, and of the Holy Ghost, is most firm and effectual; for as he that *tasteth Honey* himself, hath a more sure knowledg of its *sweetness*, than he that believeth another, speaking and witnessing of it; so he knoweth more assuredly the *Scriptures* to be God's Word, who has felt its *Divine power* on his own soul, than he who only gives credit to the Church attesting the same, as the *Samaritans* at first believed the *woman* when she spake of Christ, but after they had heard *Christ himself*, tell her, *Now we believe, not because of thy saying, for we have heard him our selves, and know that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world*, Joh. 4. 42.

Q. What

Q. What Arguments are there, besides the Testimony of the Church, to prove the Scriptures to come from God?

A. Five things (amongst many others) do especially evince the same, 1st, The *Antiquity* of it, far exceeding the most Ancient *Human Writings*, and containing *Discoveries* as Man without Divine Inspiration could never have attained to. 2^{ly}, Its miraculous *Preservation* in all Ages, against the Rage of Satan and malicious Endeavours of Tyrants to destroy it. 3^{ly}, Its wonderful and *Supernatural Effects*, in convincing, converting, and comforting the Soul; *The word of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, a discoverer of thoughts and intents of the heart*, Heb. 4. 12. 4^{ly}, The Marks of Divinity and Lineaments of heavenly Wisdom that plainly appear in it, viz. Its Majesty, Purity, *Possession*, holy and admirable Scope, profound and glorious Revelations, incomparable Promises, dreadful Threatnings, &c. 5^{ly}, The *Seals* of Divine Authority annexed to it, viz. The Spirit of Prophecy, foretelling future Events (*when the word of the Prophet shall come to pass, then shall be known, that the Lord hath truly sent him*, Jer. 28. 9. And the Power of working famous and illustrious Miracles, to confirm the Doctrine therein delivered; *Wilt thou know thou art a Teacher come from God, for no man could do the MIRACLES which thou dost, except God be with him*, Joh. 3. 2.

Q. Ought the Scriptures to be read and heard by People of all Ranks and Conditions?

A. Yes: The Lord frequently commands and commends the Reading of them by, and to the People, *Isa. 34. 16. Seek ye the book of the Lord, and read. Matt. 22. 19. Ye err, not knowing the Scriptures. Col. 3. 16. Let the word of God dwell richly in you: To this very end they were written; and therefore in the new Testament, we see some Books directed to a Noble Person,*

Like 1. Acts 1. To a Lady, 2 John v. 1. To young Men, 1 John 2. 13. To old Men, v. 14. To all Saints, or Christians, Rom. 1. 7. 1 Cor. 1. 2. as likewise the General Epistles of James, Peter, John, and Jude: We find them studied by the Ethiopian Eunuch, Acts 8. 32. Diligently searcht into by the Bereans, who are therefore intitled Noble, Acts 17. 11. Perused by godly Women, as Lois and Eunice, training up Timothy from his Childhood therein, 2 Tim. 1. and 5. compar'd with Ch. 3. 15. A special and solemn Charge is given for their being publicly read, — *I charge you by the Lord, that this Epistle be read unto all the holy Brethren,* 1 Thess. 5. 27. *When this Epistle is read amongst you, cause that it be read also in the Church of the Laodiceans,* Col. 4. 16.

Q. Ought not then the Scriptures to be Translated into the *Vulgar Tongues*, to the end they may be heard, read, and understood of all?

A. Yes undoubtedly; for since 'tis the Duty of common Christians thus diligently to peruse, and hear the Word of God, the same must certainly be in such a *Tongue* as they understand, otherwise it would be a Mockery, rather than to Edification, as is required, 1 Cor. 14. 26. Thus when God gave a Law to the *Jews*, it was in their own *Language*; and all the Prophets wrote in a *Tongue* that the common People understood. And between two and three hundred Years before Christ's coming in the *Flesh*, the *Old Testament* (as an Harbinger to prepare the *Gentiles* for the Reception of the blessed Tidings of the Gospel) was by God's Providence turned into *Greek*, and afterwards the *New Testament* written in the same *Language*, as being the common *Tongue*, or at least generally understood through a great Part of the then known *World*; and yet, that none might be destitute of these Waters of Life, soon after the Apostles times, the Holy Scriptures, especially the Books of the *New Testament*, were Translated into several other *Languages*, by Holy
and

and Learned Men, who were desirous to promote the Gospel in their respective Countreys; of which (amongst the rest) the *Vulgar Latin Version*, so much magnified by the Church of Rome, is an instance; for *Latin* being then the *Mother-Tongue* of the Romans, and understood by the common People of divers Countreys which they had conquered; the Bible for their Sakes was translated out of the *Hebrew* and *Greek*, into that Language; and is it not a *strange turn*, and highly Unjust and Uncharitable, That what was first done for the Benefit of common People, to let them into the Knowledge of the Scriptures, should now be made use of, to *debar* them of it? That the *Latin Version* composed for them that understood no other Language, should be imposed on those that understand not a word thereof, and no other Translation commonly allowed them?

Q. But are not these *Holy Books*, tho Translated into such Languages as the People understand, yet so *Obscure*, as may Discourage Humble unlearned Christians from perusing or hearing them read?

A. No, but on the contrary, so plain, as thereby they may reap wonderful benefit and advantage to their Souls, *Thy word is a light unto my feet, and a lantern to my path*, Plal. 119. 105. And again, *The entrance of thy word gives Light, it giveth understanding to the Simple*. Hence St. Augustine saith, [Ser. 55.] It is not sufficient that ye hear the Divine Scriptures in the Church, but also in your Houses, either read them your selves, or else desire some others to read them, and give diligent ear thereunto. St. Jerome on Coloss. 3. 16. *Well*, see here, (says he) that Lay-people should have not only a competent, but abundant knowledge of the Scriptures, so that one may be able to instruct another. And elsewhere he writes several Epistles to Devout Women, as to Paula, Eustochium, Salvina, Demetria, Furia, Celantia, and others, commending them for their reading and studying the Scriptures. Particularly he advises one Leta, how She should bring up her

Daughter in learning the Holy Scriptures, to read first the *Psalter*, then *Proverbs*, next *Ecclesiastes*, and *Job*, and so to go on to the *Gospels*; after those the *Propheets*, *Moses* and other *Historical Books*; whereby the Ancient Fathers Judgment appears in this matter; and in fact, abundance of Christians had *Bibles* by them, which the Heathen Persecutors would force them to deliver up, looking upon them then to have as good as renounced their *Religion*; and accordingly such as did part with them, were branded by their Brethren, with the ignominious Name of *Traditors*, *Bible-deliverers*. And indeed, the true Reason why the Church of *Rome* would keep the Scriptures from the people, is not their *Obscurity* (whatever they pretend) but because they are too plain, that is, do evidently condemn several Doctrines and Practices now currant in that Church; for who can seriously read the *second Commandment*, and yet worship *Images*? Who can impartially peruse the *Fourteenth Chapter* of *St. Paul's* first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, and yet think *Prayers* in an *unknown Tongue* justifiable or available? Who will not doubt of *Transubstantiation*, that finds the Holy Elements in the Lords-Supper several times called *Bread* by the *Apostle*, after *Consecration*, as well as before? &c.

Q. But they object, That the common Liberty for all to read the Scriptures, doth breed, or is the occasion of *Heresies*?

A. The Scripture it self teaches the contrary, That Ignorance thereof is the cause of *Error*, *Mat.* 22. 29. *Ye or, not knowing the Scriptures.* 2ly, It gives us another account whence *Errors* and *Heresies* do arise, as from *enticing words*, vain *Philosophy*, and *Fallacies*, and *Rudiments of this world*, *Col.* 2. 4, & 8. From Counterfeit *Apostolical Traditions*, *Act.* 15. 24. From pretended *Revelations* of the Spirit, a *feigned word*, and *forged writings*, *2 Thes.* 2. 2. From Satans *strange delusions* in the man of sin, and his followers, and their *Lying Signs* and *Wonders*, seducing people,

ple, 2 *Thes.* 2. 9. *Revel.* 13. 14. 3ly, Christ by the
 sure confuted the *Heretic* of the *Sadduces*; and by
 same the Apostles convinc'd the *Jews*, and the *Prime*
 Fathers the several *Heretics* of their times; whence
African calls *Heretics Lacifuge Scripturarum*, such as
 the Light of the Scriptures: And *Chrysostom* (in *Hom.*
Lazar.) saith, *The ignorance of the Scriptures hath bred*
heresies: And in *Hom.* 58. on *John*, the same Father
 us, *That the Scriptures do lead us unto God, do drive*
Heretics, and do not suffer us to go out of the way: So
 plain, the Scriptures are so far from being the cause
 Heresies, that it is the only weapon wherewith to
 and subdue them.

Q. They do not say, That the *Scripture* of its self,
 as it may be abused, or misunderstood, is the occasion
 Heresies; and therefore the allowing the promiscu-
 reading thereof, is dangerous; for does not St. Peter
 notice, that *there are many things hard to be understood,*
the ignorant and unstable wrest to their own destruction?

A. Does it follow, because there are some difficult
 passages in St. Paul's *Epistles*, (for of them St. Paul
 speaks) therefore the whole Bible must be lockt up
 common use? Or does he not rather write *Epistles*
 self to be read by all? Why should the Scriptures be
 fined, since the fault is in men, and not in them? when
 the Devil himself abused Scripture, did not our Saviour
 Scripture silence him? Or why do they in this respect
 the Scriptures should breed *Heresies* more in the
 people than in the *Learned*, and the *Priests*? Since 'tis
 dent that the first Broachers of the most decry'd *Heresies*
 were very *Learned*, as *Arius* a *Presbyter*, *Macedonius* a
 shop, *Pelagius* a *Monk*, and *Entiebes* an *Abbot* of old, and
Cicinus and others of late; insomuch that St. *Jerome* saith,
 man can (or does usually) frame an *Heretic*, but be that
 of great parts; whilst persons of *Learning* and knowledge
 by presuming to be wise above what is written, have

of ambition, and for Secular Ends embroil the Church, men of meaner Capacities, but of more piety and humility have, by the benefit of the Holy Scriptures, been preserved in the Truth. Besides, by reasoning thus from the abuse, either through ignorance, or wilfulness in any thing, we should disallow everything: we must not eat, because some are Gluttons; nor taste Wine, because too many are daily drunk with it; nor use the Art of Rhetoric, because some set their Tongues to sale; nor Logie, because not a few pervert it from the Right End, to Jangling Sophistry; Lastly, if in pure kindness, to prevent the danger of Souls, the Church of Rome will not trust them with these Holy Books, why does she provide others for them, viz. Fabulous Legends, Images and Pictures, (which they call Lay-mens books) in which there is much more danger, as from whence they are likelier far to learn Superstition and Idolatry, than any thing that will promote true Faith, and solid Piety?

Q. You have fully satisfied me, as to the Divine Authority of the Scriptures; That they are our Rule, and fully sufficient; as also that they ought to be translated and read by all Christians for their Guidance and Comfort; Therefore, I pray, proceed, and tell me briefly what the Scriptures teach us concerning God?

A. That he is a Spirit, having his being of himself, infinite, Eternal, Incomprehensible, and unchangeable in his Being, Wisdom, Power, Holiness, Justice, Goodness and Truth, the Creator of Heaven and Earth, and Sovereign Lord of all things.

Q. How many Gods are there?

A. There is but one only living true God — Deut. 6. 4. Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord. 1 Cor. 8. 6. But to us there is but one God, the Father of whom are all things?

Q. Is God one only Person also?

A. No, There are in the Godhead Three Persons, the Father,

Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and these Three are one God, the same in substance, equal in Power and Glory. *John 5. 7. There are THREE that bear record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and the Three are one. 2 Cor. 13. 33. The Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Love of God, and the Communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all. Matth. 28. 19. Baptize them in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: not in the names, but in the name, to denote the Unity of the Trinity.*

Q. How did God in the beginning create Man?

A. Good and upright, *after his own Image*; that is, endued with Knowledge, Righteousness and Holiness, *Gen. 1. 27. Eph. 4. 24.*

Q. Did Man continue in that good Estate?

A. No; our First Parents being left to the freedom of their own Will, did through, and by the Enticements of Satan, fall from that happy Condition, by transgressing God's Law, in eating of the forbidden Fruit.

Q. Did all Mankind sin in Adam?

A. Yes; For we being all in his Loins, and the Covenant made with him, not as a private Person, or only for himself, but for his Posterity too, as their common Parent; all Mankind descending from him by ordinary Generation, fell with him into an Estate of Sin and Misery. *Rom. 5. 19. By one Man's Disobedience many were made Sinners, &c. Psal. 51. 5. I was shapen in iniquity, and in so did my Mother conceive me.*

Q. What were the Consequents of this Transgression?

A. All Mankind forfeited Original Righteousness, and became corrupt in their whole nature (which is commonly call'd *Original Sin*) and prone to *Actual* Transgression in thought, word and deed, and consequently, lost Communion with God, and are under his Wrath and Curse; and so became justly liable to all Miseries in this life; and not only to death of the Body, but also *spiritual Death*, and the pains of Hell for ever. *Gen. 6. 5. The whole image*

of mans heart is evil, only evil, and that continually.
Job. 34. 3. *We were by nature children of wrath, as well as*
others. Rom. 6. 23. *The wages of sin is death.*

Q. Is the corruption of nature it self, and all the motions of it, truly and properly *sin*, even in those who are Regenerated? Or hath Lust and Concupiscence of it self, the nature of sin, though a man doth not consent to act and fulfil it?

A. The motions of the mind to evil are of Three sorts,
1. Such as are *rejected* as soon as they arise: 2ly, Such as remain a while, and *affect the soul* with some delight:
3ly, Such as both affect the mind with desire, and a man doth resolve to put them into practice. There is no Controversie about the third sort, but the dispute is touching the first and *second* only, which indeed are forbidden in the *Tenth Commandment*. For motions of the third sort are forbidden in other Commandments, as appears by our Saviour's Exposition in *Mat. 5. 22, 28*. And motions of the first and second sort are sinful, because they proceed from evil, and tend to it. Hence the Apostle Paul does more than once call Concupiscence, or *lust*, sin; *I had not known sin, but by the Law; I had not known lust, except the Law had said, Thou shalt not covet,* Rom. 7. 7. *With the mind I serve the Law of God, with the flesh the Law of sin,* v. 25. *The flesh lusteth against the spirit,* Gal. 5. 17. And the beloved Apostle tells us, *Lust is not of the Father,* 1 Joh. 2. 16.

Q. Are there any sins of their own nature *Venial*, that is, so small, that they do not deserve the *wrath* and curse of God, and everlasting death?

A. No; for though there be great differences in the degrees of sin, yet all in their own nature are mortal; for whosoever shall keep the *whole Law*, and offend in one point, is guilty of all, *Jam. 2. 10*. *Cursed is every one that doth continue in all things written in the Law,* Gal. 3. 10. *The wages of sin is death, and the gift of God eternal life,* Rom. 6. 23. In which last Text, by *Death*, must be meant *Eternal*

Death, as appears by its being opposed to Life Everlasting. The Ground of this mistake about Sins Venial, seems to be, that they take the measures of the nature of sin, from the act which is finite, and not from the Object thereby offended, which is Infinite. For all sin becomes infinite Demerit, because committed against an Infinite God, whose purity will not bear with the least sin: The offence of Lot's Wife in looking back, or the man's in gathering hay on the Sabbath, may seem small, but both proved mortal. That, for the purging away of which the Blood of Christ is necessary, must in its own nature be mortal, or deserve Eternal Death; But for the purging away of all and every sin the Blood of Christ is necessary. For it is the Blood of Jesus that cleanseth us from all (or every) sin and unrighteousness, 1 Joh. 1. 7, 9. Nor is it of any moment to say, That Venial sin is that, which although it does weaken the love of God, and our neighbour in the soul; yet does not absolutely destroy it: For there is not any sin but is repugnant to Charity (or the love of God and our Neighbour); For every sin is a transgression of the Law, but the end and sum of the Law is Charity, Mat. 22. 37, 39. Can any sin seem less than the Concupiscence of the heart, suddenly arising by an object to the sight; and yet for a man to see a woman and lust after her, our Saviour pronounces to be adultery, Mat. 5. 28. And Whoremongers and Adulterers are excluded the Kingdom of Heaven, 1 Cor. 6. 9.

Q. Did God leave all mankind to perish in this state of Sin and Misery?

A. No, but of his infinite Love, free Grace and Mercy hath provided means, both to satisfy his own Justice, and yet reconcile Man to himself by a Redeemer: God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life, Joh. 3. 16.

Q. Who is our Redeemer?

A. Our only Redeemer and Mediator, is the Lord JESUS Christ, who being the Eternal Son of God, in

second Person in the Holy Trinity, did in the fulness of time, become Man, and so was, and continueth to be God and Man, in two distinct Natures, inseparably united in one Person for ever.

1 Tim. 2. 5. For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus.

John 1. 4. And the word was made flesh, and dwelt in us (and we beheld his Glory, the Glory as of the only-begotten of the Father) full of grace and truth.

Rom. 9. 5. Whose are the Fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all God blessed for ever.

Col. 2. 9. For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.

Heb. 7. 24. But this man because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood.

Q. How did Christ, being the Eternal Son of God, become Man?

A. By assuming to himself a true Body, and a reasonable Soul, being conceived by the Power of the Holy Ghost, in the Womb of the blessed Virgin Mary, and born of her without Sin;—Behold! thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a Son, and shalt call his name Jesus, Luke 1. 31 and v. 35. The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the highest shall overshadow thee. Heb. 7. 25. Such an high priest became us, as is holy, harmless, undefiled, separated from sinners.

Q. Why was this necessary?

A. Because otherwise the mighty work of Reconciliation could not be effected, unless he that was to be the Mediator between God and Man, were conjoined to, and of the same nature with either party, and consequently both God and Man.

Q. Why must he be God?

A. That he might be able to bear the weight of Divine wrath, and pay a sufficient Ransome for sin, and be the Head of the Church, and repair his Image in us, conquering the Enemies of our Salvation, and defend us against them.

Q. And why was it?

A. Because the strictness of God's Justice required that the same nature that sinned, should suffer; He therefore took our nature, first, That he might suffer Death for us; 2ly. To Sanctifie our Nature: 3ly. That we might have access with greater boldness to the Throne of Grace. Heb. 2. 14. Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself took part of the same, that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, which is the Devil. Heb. 4. 15. We have not an High Priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, but was in all points tempted as we are, yet without sin; let us therefore come boldly to the Throne of Grace.

Q. What Offices doth Christ execute as our Redeemer?

A. Of a Prophet, in revealing to us by his Word and Spirit, the will of God, for our Salvation: Of a Priest, in once offering up himself a Sacrifice, to satisfy Divine Justice, and reconcile us to God, and in making continual Intercession for us to God; and of a King, in vanquishing Death, Sin and Hell, by his Crucifixion, Resurrection, and Ascension, as also in subduing us to himself by his Grace, thereby ruling and defending us, and restraining and conquering all his and our Enemies.

Q. By what means are we made partakers of Christ and all his Benefits?

A. By a lively FAITH in him (begotten by the Word of God read, or Preached) attended with a sincere O-BEDIENCE to the Gospel, both which are increased by Prayer, and the due Receiving of the SACRAMENTS Instituted by our Blessed Saviour.

Q. Where have you a brief Summary of the Christian Faith?

A. In that Creed commonly called the Apostles, —
I believe in God the Father Almighty, &c.

Q. What do you mean when in the Creed you say, I believe the Catholick Church?

A. The

A. The word *Catholic* is originally Greek, and signifies as much in English as *Whole*, or *Universal*; and so *Catholic Church*. 1. Properly signifies the *whole Church* of God *Triumphant* and *Militant*, even as many as ever shall be saved, the *Universal company* of the *Elect*, who are all but *one body*, knit together in one Faith, under *one Head*, viz. the Lord Jesus Christ, Gal. 3. 28. For ye are *all one in Christ*. Ephes. 4. 4. *There is one body, and one spirit, even as ye are called in one hope*. And this is the sense of the word in the Creed, which we use there to signify, That we believe, that notwithstanding all the endeavours of Satan, this holy *Elect-company* shall always remain, and be compleated; and not only that there is *such a Church* in general, but that we *our selves* appertain to it; this *Catholick Church* is frequently stiled in Scripture, *The body and Spouse of Christ*; as also, *The Universal Assembly of the first-born written in Heaven*, Heb. 12. 23. *Jerusalem which is above, the Mother of us all*, Gal. 4. 26. Of whom therefore that famous saying of St. Cyprian is most properly to be understood, — *How can he have God for his Father, that bath not the Church for his Mother?* At least, that he meant it not of the Church of Rome is evident, because himself at the same time stood out in opposition to *Her*, and wrote against her Bishop (how justly, is nothing to the present purpose) in the Point of *Rebaptizing* such as had been Baptized by Hereticks, and returned to the Orthodox Church: Of the *Catholick Church* in this sense St. Augustine in his *Traet de Catechizandis rudibus*, cap. 1. speaks thus, *All they that be holy and sanctified, which are, have been, and shall be, are Citizens of the Heavenly Jerusalem*. And Gregory a Pope (if that will make the proof more Authentick) *Mor. in Job, Lib. 28. cap. 9.* 'All the *Elect* are embraced in the Bosom of the Church, and all the *Reprobates* are without.

2ly, The Epithet *Catholic* when joined to Church in a less proper sense, is used to express only the whole *Visible*

or *Militant Church*; and seems first to have grown into General use, (though I remember it not in *Scripture*) in the *Primitive times*, to denote the *Extension* of the Church of God, as no longer confin'd to the *Jews*, but the partition-wall (as the Apostle speaks, *Ephes. 2. 14.*) being brought down, Universally spread abroad in every Nation (*Jew or Gentile*) where the Gospel was preached and entertained: And thus it comprehends all the several Churches on the face of the Earth, as of *Jerusalem, Antioch, Britain, Rome, &c.* and all Christians in those Churches, whether *Sincere*, or *Hypocrites*, that make an outward profession of Faith in Christ; as all the *Boughs* of a Tree, however spread and scattered, one from another, and some dead and withering, whilst others flourish, are united in one common *stem*, tho not equally deriving Sap from the *Root*.

3ly, In this latter restrained signification, as it denoted all the particular Churches in the world, so when the *Donatists* about the fourth Century, began to hold Erroneous opinions, and wistful to confine the Church of God to those of their own *Sett*, in a corner of *Africa*, *St. Augustine*, and others, frequently urged against them, That the Church was *Catholic*, (that is, *Universal*, not cooped up to their narrow Limits) and maintain'd a *sounder Doctrine*; whence it came to pass, that though the more Ancient Fathers never used this term *Catholic*, to distinguish the *pure Church* from the *Heretical*, but called the former *Orthodox*, that is holding the *right Doctrine*; yet in process of time by reason that the *Orthodox Churches* held and maintain'd the Church of Christ to be *Catholic*, or *Universal*, these two words *Catholic* and *Orthodox*, were taken in one and the same signification; nor was it incongruous; for if Churches did faithfully keep the Gospel inire, which had been Preached by the Apostles every where, both such Churches and Doctrines might justly be intitled *Catholic*. And in this sense a particular Church;

is pure and Orthodox, may be called *A Catholic Church*, but not *The Catholic Church*; and is more or less Catholic, proportionably as it is more or less pure.

Q Does the Title of the *Catholic Church* in any of these senses belong to the present *Church of Rome*?

A No; not in the first, for then all the faithful under the Old Testament, and vast numbers of Churches and Christians since, and at this day, (far exceeding for multitude her members) that never were, nor are of her Communion, (that is, never own'd themselves subject to the Pope's Name) as the alone visible Head of the Church, which with them is the Characteristic-mark of being of their Church, (*Vide Extrav. C. Unam Sanctam, & Bellarmin. de Inf. Mil. Lib. 3. Cap. 2. & 5.*) must be excluded the Kingdom of Heaven. Nor will they (I think) pretend, That all and every of their Members are undoubtedly saved; so they offer abundance more, and easier ways for that purpose than Almighty God hath revealed in his Word.

Not in the second; Because the Church of Rome ever was and is a particular Church; and (when at best) but one member of the *Church Catholic*, which is so called; so that it is always every where; but for that no Country is excluded, nor any place privileged; so that there may be a thousand Churches besides that of Rome, and no place being privileged, even Rome it self, may be cut off from the Church. For particular Churches may not only be corrupted, but totally fail and Apollatize; for tho they may be called Catholic, as long as they hold the Primitive Faith intire, yet that imports not, That a Catholic (that is in this sense a Orthodox) Church, must always be where once it has been. For in what a condition now are the once famous Greek Churches of *Asia*? where are the Churches of *Constantinople*, of *Hippo*, &c. And therefore *Vincentius Lyrinensis* justly makes a difference between a Catholic in place, and a Catholic in name: 'If (saith he) any new Infection goes on to corrupt, not a part, but the whole Church, then must we

' cleave to Antiquity. And again, ' That Church
' Catholic which holds that Religion which hath been
' hitherto embraced.

Neither can the present Church of Rome in the sense be properly stiled *Catholic*; for thereby is meant *pure Church*, that holds intire the Ancient Primitive Doctrine delivered by Christ and his Apostles, without any Corruptions that may endanger, or overthrow the same. But we can prove, and 'tis apparent, That *she* is deeply guilty by altering and diminishing Christ's Ordinances, adding to the *Scriptures* and *Sacraments*; Introducing, and imposing as necessary to Salvation, divers Doctrines and practices that have no ground in Scripture, and were unknown to the Primitive Church. Nay, as for truly Christian and Apostolical Antiquity (the only Root and essential Character of Catholic Doctrine) they cannot name any *one Article* proper to their own *Roman Faith* that in this sense is *Ancient*: And as to *those Articles* which they have in common with us, 'tis sad to consider how they abuse them, and almost subvert the whole design of the Gospel by the *intermixture* of their peculiar *Roman ones*.

Q. We shall have occasion further to consider this afterwards in *particulars*; But in the mean time are not you wanting in your *Enumeration*; For the Advocates of *Rome* alledge, That tho they do not reckon her to be the Catholic Church *collectively*, or *extensively*; yet *she* is so *virtually* and *eminently*; because *she* has Power over, and *the Government* of all other Christian Churches?

A. Tho this notion of calling a particular Church *Catholic*, from a supposed power of *Empire* over all other Churches, be very odd, and altogether unknown to Antiquity; yet the greater difficulty is in the *thing itself*. How it can be made appear, That the *Roman Church* has any such *lawful power*: For 1st. There is not the least ground or colour for it in Holy Scripture; And how could the Apostle say, *That he had revealed the whole counsel*

God, if so important a point, so absolutely necessary (as they pretend), for preventing *Schisms*, crushing *Errors*, and preserving *Unity* and *Truth*, were concealed and left in the dark? But so far silent are the Scriptures herein, That the whole *New Testament*, where there is mention of so many other Churches by name, contains not any such words as *The Church of Rome*: For tho we are assured there was a Church there, (and very famous too, for its vigour of Faith and Piety) yet this omission of calling it so in *Divine Writ*, may seem designed, as a way to its future Usurpations. But 2ly, As the Church of Bishops of *Rome* for several hundreds of years never dur'd, or exerted this power, (for as for their swarms of pretended *Decretal Epistles*, they have long since by all wise men been exploded as *spurious*) so it was unknown to, unheard of amongst the *Primitive Churches* and *Fathers*. As for instance, St. *Cyprian* and St. *Augustine*, who are all for keeping close to the *Catholick Church*, yet zealous at the same time against submitting themselves, or their Churches, to the pleasure of that of *Rome*. How insolent were most of the Fathers towards the Bishops of *Rome* of their times, if they believed them their Masters, to treat them commonly in so familiar a style as that of their Brethren and Fellow-Servants, and no more? When did St. *Chrysostom*, or St. *Basil* swear *Canonical Obedience* to his Holiness? How much Money did they send to *Rome*, when they obtained from thence their *Episcopal Pal*? Nay, Did not Pope *Gregory* himself, 600 years after Christ, express his abhorrence of the Title of *Universal Bishop*, as a mark of Antichrist? 3ly, We have the Testimony of another that was afterwards Pope himself——That before the *Nicene-Council*, other Christian Churches little regarded the Roman Church; [Æn. Syl. Epist. L. 1. Epist. 288.] And all the World may know both how shamefully two *Canons* forged on that *Nicene Council*, by the Bishops of *Rome*, to colour their designed

Usurpation

Usurpation in the matters of Appeal, were detected by Council of Carthage, about the year 418. And how was he, a Traytor, Rebel, and Murtherer of his Sovereign first bestow'd on them the Title of *Universal Bishops*, about the year 604.

Q. But they say, this *Catholic Power* is derived to them by *Lawful Succession* from St. Peter, who had it given him by Christ; and that he being *Bishop of Rome*, bequeathed it to their Popes, his Successors in that Chair. Therefore I demand, first, Whether St. Peter were *Prince of Apostles*, That is, had a Sovereign Power over them, and consequently over all the Churches by them any way planted?

A. Not at all: For the Apostles had all equal Power and Authority — Jesus said (speaking to the Apostles themselves) *the Princes of the Gentiles exercise Dominion, but it shall not be so amongst you*, Matt. 8. 25. The rest of the Apostles sent as well Peter, as John, on a Mission, Acts 13. 14. How improper had that been, if he had been their Sovereign? I was not (saith St. Paul, 1 Cor. 4. 15.) *a man inferior to the very chiefest of the Apostles*. — And again, *When Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed*: Nay St. Peter himself, in his Epistles, as he qualifies himself only with the title of an *Apostle*, 1 Pet. 1. and chap. 5. 1. of an *Elder*, and *Witness* of the Sufferings of Christ; so in the third verse of that Chapter, he disclaims in himself, as well as forbids in others, *the Lording over God's Heritage*; — *Μηδ' ος Κληρονομιᾶς ος Κληρον.*

Q. What say you to that Text, *Matth. 16. 18. Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock will I build my Church; I give unto thee the Key of the Kingdom of Heaven*: And that repeated endearing Expression, *Feed my Lambs, feed my Sheep*; John 21. 15, 16, 17. Was not the Government of the *Universal Church* hereby particularly committed to Peter?

A. In no wise any more to him, than to the other Apostles.

Apostles. For as to the first Text, *The Rock* was not the Person of *Peter*, but that good Confession he had made in the Verse foregoing; *Thou art Christ, the Son of the Living God:* And the same Power is committed to all the rest of the *Apostles*, *John* 20. 23. and *Matth.* 18. 18. Then *Jesus* said to them, *Whose sins ye remit, &c.* And as to the second Text, The Ancient Fathers, and all sound Interpreters understand it to be rather a restitution of *Peter* to his Office of an *Apostle*, which he might seem to have forfeited by his Fall, than a Communication of any new Sovereign Power; For he having thrice denied his Master, the Question, *Whether he loved him?* was thrice proposed; and that Commandment of feeding *Christ's* Lambs and Sheep; as oft repeated, both to authorize and quicken him in that duty which was equally common to the rest of the *Apostles*; as we read, *Ye* (that's the Church of God) *are built upon the Foundation of the Apostles*, *Eph.* 2. 20. *The City had twelve Foundations, and in them the names of the twelve Apostles*, *Rev.* 21. 14.

Q. Was *St. Peter* Bishop of *Rome*?

A. *St. Peter* was an *Apostle*, and *Apostles* were not properly Bishops in a strict sense, because not deputed to any certain Place, but had the whole World for their Diocess; as so runs their Commission, *Go you into all the World, preach the Gospel to every Creature*; *Mark* 16. 15. *Peter* in a peculiar manner chiefly bestow'd his Labours amongst the Jews, and this too by a special Agreement between him and *Paul*, *Gal.* 2. 9. and therefore was call'd the *Apostle of the Circumcision*: And so far are the Scriptures from intimating that he was Bishop of *Rome*, or ever there, that the contrary may thence very probably be concluded. And for the Ancient Writers that speak of *Peter's* being at *Rome*, and suffering there, they agree not together in the Circumstances of the Story, some are Counterfeit, some Fabulous, none that lived in that, or the next Age, but all uncertain.

Q. Who

Q. Who is the *Head* of the Universal Church?

A. The Scriptures say expressly that *Christ* is the *Head* of the Church, Col. 1. 18. *God hath given Christ to be Head over all things, to his Church, which is his Body, Eph. 1. 22. As the Husband is the Head of the Wife, so Christ is the Head of the Church, Eph. 5. 23.* and many other places. This also appears from the properties of the *Head*, as to be the highest, to prescribe *Laws*, Jam. 4. 12. To convey the power of *Life* and *Motion* into all the *Members*, Eph. 1. 15, 16. and lastly, to be the *Saviour* of the *Body*,—Eph. 5. 23. all which solely appertain to *Christ*.

Q. But is not the Pope *Christ's Vicar*, or *Supream* *Head* of the Universal Church on Earth?

A. Not at all; *Christ* never appointed any *Vicar*, but the *Holy Ghost*, nor had any need so to do; for every *Vicar* is to supply the absence of him, whose *Vicar* he is, but *Christ* is always present with his Church, by his *Word*, *Spirit* and *Power*; *Peter* himself had no such *Supream Headship* conferred upon him above the rest of the *Apostles*, as was proved before; nor was he ever *Bishop of Rome*, properly so called; nor can they prove he *died at Rome*; or if he did, that his pretended *Supream Headship* was *successive*; or that the Pope is his *Successor* in *Life* and *Doctrine*, or has any special Authority derived from him.

See Dr. Bre-
vine's *Saul and*
Samuel as En-
dow, p. 30.

Therefore upon the whole matter we may conclude, That the present Church of *Rome* is not the *True*, nor a *truly Catholic* Church. Not the *Catholic Church*; for this she cannot pretend to, but upon the account of an *Universal Headship* or *Jurisdiction* over all *Christian Churches*; which being *groundless*, where-ever by her *triles* and outward force it does prevail, 'tis an *Encroachment*; and where it does not, a *Fable*. Nor is she *truly Catholic*; either by her own proper *Doctrines*, *Laws* and *Worship*, which are all *New*, *Local* and *Un-apostolical*; or by those *Common Principles* of *Christianity* that she re-

us with us, and all other Christians, since she detains them in *unrighteousness*; not *intire*, but mangled, opposed, overwhelmed, oppressed, and groaning under many heavy, massy Burthens of Superstitions and Abuses. 'Tis true, If we take this *mixt and confused Body* (more Heterogeneously compounded, than *Daniel's Image*, I mean the *Roman Church*) at the best side, as it holds yet the Fundamental Grounds of Christianity which we profess, thus far we grant it is a *true Church*. But if we take it at the worst, as to its *proper Roman Doctrines*, wherein it differs from us, no more than from all true Catholick and Apostolical *Antiquity*; then, if at all it may be said to be truly a Church, yet a most corrupted and infected one. And if we come to join these two incompatible parts together, in order to an absolute estimate and denomination of the whole, I scarce know *what Title* it may deserve. The *Samaritans*, who both feared the Lord, and worshipped their *Graven Images*, 2 Kings 17. 41. were without doubt *Idolaters*; and God threatens to cut off them that swear by the Lord and *Maleham*, Zeph. 1. 5. What sincere *Israelite* would venture his Soul on the Religion of *Dan and Bethel*, tho they retained, and still professed to reverence *Moses's Law*? Nor is it to any purpose, That they call themselves, or are often called *Catholics* by others; for men may give themselves what *Titles* they are best pleased with, and yet have no right to them; And if *Protestants* now and then call them so, it is either out of *ignorance* (for many are not acquainted with the true signification of the word) or a civil *Complement*, in compliance with their own Custom, as sometimes we call *Turks, Musulmans*, (which signifies *true Believers*) because we hear them generally, tho most falsely, call themselves so.

Q. Is the Church *Infallible*, or free from Error?

A. No; For altho the *Catholick Church* doth not err in the Fundamentals of Faith, so as to *cease to be*, in which sense Christ hath promised (if that Promise relate to the Church

Church in general, and not only to the Apostles, as we think) *To be with her to the end of the World*; And that *Gates of Hell shall not prevail against her*; yet she is not exempt from Error, seeing there is no Member of her perfect in this Life.

But as for any particular Church (as that of *Ephesus, Thyatira, Rome*, or the like) she may both err, and become an Harlot, that is, utterly cease to be a true Church of Christ.

The *Romanists* that boast of *Infallibility*, know not where 'tis lodged; some, as the *Jesuits*, say, in the Person of the Pope, whom they call the Church virtual; The French Clergy, and others of their Doctors, in a General Council (which they term the *Representative Church*) others in a General Council and the Pope, agreeing with, and confirming the same. But the Texts and Reasons alledged for the two first Opinions mutually overthrow each other; (For the Assertors of the Infallibility of Councils deny Infallibility to the Pope, further than he adheres to such Councils; so the Abettors of Papal Infallibility allow to Councils no Infallibility, but what they have in dependance upon, and influence from the Pope;) and how the clubbing of two such Fallibles should make one Infallibility, is hard to conceive; besides, such Combination affords no relief, but during the Council's sitting; for as soon as 'tis broken up, their Writings must endure the same fate with what they would have those of the Apostles subject to, viz. being *unable to judge or decide Controversies*; for on that score all *Romanists* most vehemently plead for a necessity of a living, visible, Infallible Judge, that can hear both Parties and determine all emergent Differences. Lastly, therefore, Some attribute Infallibility to the Church diffuse viz. That Councils are then only infallible, and their Decrees unquestionable, when they are received by, and have the tacit Consent and Approbation of the whole Church; that is, they are not infallible till every body thinks them so.

The Patrons of all these four Opinions in the Church of Rome millitate fiercely against each other, and yet are all owned to be *good Catholics*, and Members of that Church which professes she *alone* has got an infallible way of determining all Doubts and Controversies: It seems they are certain they have got *Infallibility* somewhere in their Church; but as they know not where to find it, so neither is she so good-natured as to inform them, and put an end to their *Debates at home*, tho yet they make a mighty noise with the *Word abroad*, to inveigle others to their Party.

Q. You mention'd *Faith* before in general; be pleased therefore to tell me what you understand thereby?

A. Faith is a *firm Assent* to the truth of the whole Word of God, and therein especially such a *fiducial Reception* of, and *Reliance on* the Promises of Reconciliation, freely given through, and for the sake of Christ our Mediator, as causeth the Soul to embrace the same, and build its *External Happiness* thereon; Or [in the words of our Church, in the Homily of Faith] 'A true trust and confidence of the Mercy of God through our Lord Jesus Christ, and a steadfast Hope of all good things to be received at God's hand; an earnest Trust and Confidence in God, that he doth regard us for his only Son's sake; distinguished in kind from Historical Faith, or the Faith of meer Assent, which is in the Devils, and the Damned; — God so loved the World, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life, John 3. 16. Believe on the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved, Acts 16. 31. By him all that believe are justified from all things from which you could not be justified by the Law of Moses, Acts 13. 39. The Devils believe, and tremble, Jam. 2. 19.'

Q. What then is *Justification*?

A. Justification is that sentence of God, whereby of his own Grace, for the Righteousness of his Son, by him

D

imputed

B. Usher's
B. Divinity,
fo. 193.

imputed unto us, and through Faith, apprehended by us, he doth free us from Sin and Death, and accept us as righteous unto life. Or, [in the words of the Twelfth Article of the Church of England] 'We are accounted Righteous before God only for the Merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by Faith, and not for our own Works or Deservings; wherefore that we are justified by Faith only, is a most wholsome Doctrine, and very full of Comfort; — Rom. 8. 33. *Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's Elect? It is God that justifieth; Who is he that condemneth? it is Christ that died.* 1 Cor. 1. 30. *He of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us Wisdom, and Righteousness, and Sanctification, and Redemption.* Rom. 4. 3. *Abraham believed God, and it was accounted unto him for Righteousness: And vers. 6, 7. Even as David describeth the Blessedness of the Man unto whom God will impute Righteousness; Saying, Blessed are they whose Iniquities are forgiven, and whose Sins are covered; Blessed is the man whom the Lord will not impute sin.* Gal. 2. 16. *A man is not justified by the Works of the Law, but by the Faith of Jesus Christ.* Rom. 4. 4, 5. *For to him that worketh is the Reward not reckoned of Grace, but of Debt; but to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifies the Ungodly, his Faith is accounted for Righteousness; as Phil. 3. 8. I account all things Dung, that I may gain Christ, and may be found in him, not having my own Righteousness, which is by the Law, but that which is by the Faith of Christ, that is the Righteousness of God by Faith.*

From these and other the like Scriptures, we gather That we are justified, that is to say, have our Sins forgiven, and are able to appear with assurance before the Tribunal of God's Infinite Justice, solely for, and through the Merits and Satisfaction of Christ applied by Faith, in which sense we say Faith only justifies: For tho true Faith is never alone, but always worketh by love; Gal. 5. 6.

we distinguish *Justification* from *Sanctification*; (or the renewal of our Nature by the production of Habits of Righteousness) looking upon the latter as a necessary Effect, but not as the Cause of our Justification; (according to St. Augustine's Rule — *Bona opera non precedunt Justificationem, sed sequuntur Justificationem*, Good Works go not before, but follow Justification;) for the same being only begun in this Life, and imperfect, how can it justify us in the sight of God? Therefore tho both Justification and Sanctification go together, yet they are differently to be considered, as *Heat* and *Light* in fire are always conjoin'd; and yet we cannot say, that the *Light* burns the Wood, but only the *Heat*: Thus the Righteousness whereby we are justified, is inherent in Christ for us, this of Sanctification is us, from him; the one follows from the *Merit*, the other from the *Efficacy* of the Life and Death of Christ; in the one Faith is only as an *hand* receiving, in the other as a *co-working Virtue*; the one is in all Believers at all times, the other wrought differently, and by degrees: and tho the End of both be Eternal Life, yet the one is *inter Causas Regnandi*, a Cause of Reigning, the other only as *via ad Regnum*, the way to the Kingdom.

Q. Doth the word *Justify* in Scripture signify to infuse, or put Righteousness into a man?

A. We find not one Text (at least where the Doctrine of Justification is professedly treated of) that can allow of such a sense, as making Righteousness by actual or habitual Righteousness inherent in us, but it generally imports, to *absolve*, or pronounce a man righteous by *quitting* or discharging from some Guilt, or Accusation; as Prov. 17. 15. *He that justifies the Wicked, and he that condemneth the Just, are an abomination to the Lord*; It is a Judicial Sentence opposed to Condemnation, Rom. 8. 34. Now as to *condemn* is not the putting any evil into the Nature of the Party condemned, but the pronouncing of him *Guilty*, and binding him to Punishment; so justify-

ing is the Judges Declaration that the Law is *satisfied*, and the Person quitted from Guilt and Punishment.

Q. What is the Doctrine of the Church of Rome, touching Justification?

A. Its certain Doctrine in this matter is not very easily found or apprehended. For first, Their old Schoolmen tell us of Merit of *Congruity*, whereby a man disposed himself for the reception of Grace; of *Gratia gratum faciens*, a quality or habit of Charity, whereby a man is rendered acceptable to God; and of *Merit of Condignity*, whereby the Regenerate by their Works deserve Eternal Life.

Secondly, Their Council of *Trent* refraining from those School-terms, handle the matter cautiously, and more in *Scripture-expressions*, but 'tis justly suspected still mean the same. For first, Tho they acknowledg [*Seff. 6. Ca. 1.*] That 'Christ is proposed by God the Propitiator for our 'Sins by Faith in his Blood: And *Ca. 4.* That 'Justification is a transferring from that state in which a man 'is born the Son of the First *Adam* (in which, *Ca. 1.* they 'confess, we are unclean, the Sons of Wrath, Servants of 'Sin, and under the Power of the Devil and Death, from 'which the *Gentiles* by no strength of Nature, nor the 'Jews by the Letter of the Law could raise or deliver 'themselves) into a state of Grace and Adoption, to be 'the Sons of God by the Second *Adam*; yet *Ca. 5.* They speak of Man's co-operating with God's Call, or preventing Grace; of *converting himself*, and being *disposed to his own Justification*.

'This manner of preparation for Justification (say 'they, *esp. 6.*) is whilst excited and help'd by Divine 'Grace, receiving Faith by hearing, they are freely moved towards God, believing those things to be true 'which are revealed and promised, and especially that 'God does justify the ungodly by his Grace through the 'Redemption which is in Christ; and whilst understanding themselves to be sinners by the fear of the Divine Justice

Justice (with which they are profitably smitten) by converting themselves to consider Gods mercy, they are raised unto Hope, considering that God for Christ will be propitious to them, and so begin to love him as the Fountain of all Righteousness; and for that cause are moved against sin by a certain Hatred and Detestation, that is, by that Repentance which ought to precede Baptism. And lastly, whilst they purpose to receive Baptism, to begin a new Life, and keep the Divine Commands.

Then in the 7th Chap. they proceed to acquaint us, That after this Disposition or Preparation, *Justification* it self follows, which is not only the remission of sins, but also *Sanctification*, and the renewal of the inward man by a voluntary susception of Grace, and those Gifts, whence a man of unjust is made just, and of an Enemy a Friend, that he may be an Heir according to Hope of Life Eternal. The causes of which Justification (say they) are these, viz. *The Final*, the Glory of God and Christ, and Eternal Life: *The Efficient*, the mercy of God, who freely washes and sanctifies, signing and anointing by the Holy Spirit of Promise, who is the Pledg of our Inheritance. *The Meritorious* cause, his most beloved only Son our Lord, who whilst we were Enemies, for that abundant charity wherewith he loved us, by his most holy Passion on the Cross, Merited for us Justification, and satisfied God the Father for us. *The Instrumental*, cause the Sacrament of Baptism, which is the Sacrament of Faith, without which never any was justified. Lastly, the only *Formal cause*, is the Righteousness of God, not that whereby he himself is righteous, but by which he makes us righteous, to wit, by which given by him we are renewed in the Spirit of our mind, and not only reputed, but are truly righteous, receiving righteousness in our selves, every one according to his measure, which the Holy Ghost imparts to each person according to every mans proper Disposition and cooperation.

Cap. 8. Whereas the Apostle saith, that a man is justified by Faith only, and that *Gratis*: These words are to be understood, That therefore we are said to be justified by Faith, because Faith is the beginning, Foundation, and root of all Justification; and *Gratis*, because none of those things that *precede* Justification, either Faith or Works, do *deserve* the Grace of Justification. *Cap. 10.* Being thus justified, and made the Friends and Household of God, going on from virtue to virtue, they are renewed (as the Apostle saith) day by day; that is, by mortifying the members of their flesh, and by exhibiting those Arms of Righteousness unto Sanctification, by the observance of the Commands of God and the Church, and Faith cooperating with good Works, they grow in that Righteousness received by the Grace of Christ, and are further justified, or made more righteous.

Cap. 14. That those who by sin are fallen from the received Grace of Justification, may again be justified, when God exciting by the Sacrament of Penance, by the Merit of Christ, they shall have procur'd a recovery of that lost Grace.

Then they proceed to *CANONS*, amongst which are these, *Can. 9.* If any one shall say, That a man is justified only by Faith, understanding nothing else to be required, that cooperates to the obtaining the Grace of Justification, and that in no behalf 'tis necessary for him to be prepared and disposed by the motion of his will, let him be *Anathema*, (that is Accursed).

Can. 11. If any one shall say, That men are justified either by the alone Imputation of the Righteousness of Christ, or by the alone Remission of his sins, the Grace and Charity excluded which in their hearts is dissolved by the Holy Ghost, and adheres in them; or that the Grace whereby we are justified, is only the favour of God, let him be *Anathema*.

Can. 12. ' If any one shall say, That justifying Faith is nothing else but a trusty reliance on the Divine mercy, pardoning our sins for the *sake of Christ*, or that such trust or confidence is that *alone* by which we are justified, let him be *Anathema*.

Can. 24. ' If any one shall say, That Justification received is not conserved, and also *increased* before God by good works, but that the works themselves are only *Fruits* and *Signs* of Justification obtained, but not a cause of augmenting the same, let him be *Anathema*.

Lastly, *Can. 33.* ' If any shall say, That this Catholic Doctrine of Justification, expressed by the Holy Synod, in this present Decree, does in any respect *Derogate* from the Glory of God, and Merits of our Lord Jesus Christ, and not rather *illustrate* the Truth of our Faith, and the Glory of God and Christ Jesus, let him be *Accursed*.

I have thus at large set forth the Doctrine of the Church of Rome touching *Justification*, declared by the Council of *Trent* in their own words: 1. That I might not seem to *wrong* them: 2ly, That our *unlearned* people might understand *what* is by that Church Established. For though this pretended Council were several Months in *Forging*, *Hammering*, and *Filing* this Decree, and have *worded* it very subtilly, so as to make it *most taking* and plausible; yet the *discreet Christian* will see through all those Artifices, and be better *arm'd* against those of their late Writers, that would yet further palliate their Doctrine herein, even beyond what the very words of this Council will allow.

To make a *Formal Answer* to all these Particulars, and winnow the chaff from the Wheat, would be too tedious, and unnecessary, as well because it has already been done by several Protestant Divines; as for that, 'tis evident they ascribe Justification, if not wholly, yet at least in part to *Inherent Righteousness*, or our own works perform'd by Grace bestow'd (thereby to leave room for

Merits, Purgatory, Indulgent, &c.) which needs only be compared with the Scripture before cited. To which might be added divers Testimonies of the Ancient Fathers; as St. Ambrose, who on the third of the Roman faith, *Non justificari hominem apud Deum nisi per fidem*: *Man is not justified with God but by Faith.* And again, *They were freely justified by his Grace; they were justified freely for meriting nothing, neither making any recompence; they were justified only through Faith by the Gift of God.* And St. Basil, worthily named the Great [in his Homily *Παρά Των Μοναχων*, or, of Humility.] *Αὐτὸ γὰρ δὲ ἡ τῆς αἰσῆς, &c.* *Perfect and sound rejoicing in God, is this, when a man doth not boast of his own Righteousness, but knoweth that he wanteth himself true Righteousness, and that he is justified, [Πῶς μὲν] by only Faith in Christ, and therefore Paul doth glory in the contempt of his own Righteousness.* So St. Chrysostom in his third Homily on *Ten.* *If thou believest, why dost thou bring in other things to Faith, as if Faith only were not sufficient to justify.* Nor can this Doctrine, That we are (partly at least) *Justified by Inherent Righteousness*, be excused, because those that maintain it, confess they are beholden to God for such *their Righteousness*; for even the Pharisee, *Luk. 18.* who trusted in his own Righteousness, yet ascribed it to the *Grace of God*; *I thank thee* (says he) *that I am not like other men*: He boasted not before men, but gave thanks to God, acknowledging his Righteousness to be God's gift, and yet Christ delivers this Parable against him, and such as he was, who trust in their own works, that they are Righteous by Justice inherent, altho they acknowledge they have it by the Grace and gift of God.

Q. I am satisfied in this Point; yet for further illustration, be pleased to tell me, whether in this life we can perfectly fulfil the Law of God, that is, whether any person (our Blessed Saviour only excepted) did ever fully keep all the Commandments?

A. Not I, but the Scriptures shall answer you. There is not a just man upon Earth, that doth good and sinneth not, Eccles. 7. 20. If we say we have no sin, we deceive our selves, 1 Joh. 1. 8. In many things we offend all, Jam. 3. 2. The truth is, we are so far from keeping the Law, that even in the best of our works we are deficient, as the Church and St. Paul confesses, Isa. 64. 6. Rom. 7. 6. & 21. But this Inability is not from the nature of the Law originally, but from the voluntary corruption of man, and so we are to understand the Ancient Fathers, when they say, *That God doth not command things impossible*; for elsewhere they affirm, *That the highest perfection of a Christian is to see his own imperfection*. For the Grace of God never raiseth man in this life to a perfect exact unsinning obedience, but an obedience sincere, all the perfection here attainable, being when the Will habitually entertains nothing that is contrary to the will of God.

Q. What is the Doctrine of the Church of Rome touching Merits?

A. Some of their late Writers say, That Merit according to their sense of the word, signifies no more than *actions done by the assistance of Gods Grace, to which his Goodness to promise a reward*; not that this Merit or Rewardableness arises from the value even of our best actions; and that when they have done all those things that are commanded, they are *unprofitable servants*. Now if this be truly all their Doctrine in this Point, we are heartily ready to agree with them therein; but we think there's somewhat more implied or understood by those Canons of the Council of Trent, Sess. 6. Can. 26. 'If any one shall say, That the Just for the good works which they shall have done in God, ought not to expect and hope for eternal Retribution from God, through his mercy, and the merit of Jesus Christ, if by well-doing, and keeping the Divine Commands, they shall persevere to the end, let him be Accursed.

And

And *Ch. 32.* If any one shall say, That the works of a justified person are so the gift of God, that they are not also the good merits of such person; that he by those good works which are done by him through the Grace of God, and Merit of Christ (whom he is a living member) does not truly MERIT [that is, as I conceive, deserve or Earn] increase of Grace, and Life Eternal; and (provided always he be in Grace) both the attainment of Eternal Life, and increase of Glory, let him be Accursed.

Thus their allowed Authors teach, that good works do not only merit in respect of God's *Gracious Covenant*, but in regard of the works themselves; and that Eternal Life is not only due from Gods *Liberalty*, but from his just *Judgment*. *Bellarmin, L. 5. C. 16, & 17.* And they give this reason for it, That because God would honour his children, he would have them to get Heaven by their Merits, which is more honourable than to receive it by Gods free gift. *Vasquez* is yet more plain, and sticks not to affirm, 'That the works of men do merit Eternal Life, as an equal *Recompence* and Reward; that therefore there needs not any other condign merit, as that of Christ, to interpose that Eternal Life should be rendered to them; therefore (saith he) we never pray to God, that by the Merits of Christ the Reward of Eternal Life may be given to our works and meritorious works, but that Christ's Grace may be given to us, whereby WE may be enabled worthily to merit this Reward.

Q. What are we to think of this Doctrine?
A. That it is false and sacrilegious; robbing God of his Glory, and our Lord Christ of the sole Honour of our Redemption. For on the direct contrary, the Scriptures witness, That eternal life is the gift of God, *Rom. 6.* Now a gift is free, and cannot be merited; for then it were a purchase. To him that works (saith the Apostle) the reward is reckoned not of grace, but of Debt, *Rom. 4.*

Christ alone is the storehouse of our Merits; every true believer is worthy; not by his own Works, but in Christ, and by his Merits and Righteousness, Eph. 2. 8. By grace ye are saved through faith, and that not of our selves, it is the gift of God; not of works; lest any man should boast. Tit. 3. 5. Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he hath saved us. For 1st, our best Works are imperfect; nay, St. Paul saith of himself, *Tu I know nothing by my self, yet am I not thereby justified,* 1 Cor. 4. 4. 2dly, There's a vast Disproportion between them and the Glory to come. 3dly, They are Debts which we owe to God. 4thly, As good, they proceed from the Spirit of God, and what merit can there be in paying an old Debt; especially when he to whom it's paid, lends us at present the Money? 5thly, We do not profit God by them: *If thou be righteous, what givest thou to God, or what receiveth he at thy hands?* Job 35. 7. Why then should we qualify them thus arrogantly with the Title of Merits? To say, That Christ by his Death merited that our Works should merit Everlasting Life, is to make our selves Partners with Christ, and so in effect, our own Saviours and Redeemers.

Q. Is not the word Reward often mentioned in Scripture, as, *He shall reward every man according to his works,* Matth. 16. 27. *Great is your reward in heaven,* Matth. 5. 12. *He had respect to the recompence of reward,* Heb. 11. 26,

A. There is a Reward of Mercy and Grace, and of Desert or Merit; the one may be of bounty far above any due to the Party, but so is not the other: This is St. Ambrose's Distinction [Ep. 1. 1.] *There is one kind of Reward for Liberality, and another of the Wages of Virtues and Recompence of Labours.* Thus God rewards two ways, either in mere Justice, and so he rewards the Wicked, justly deserving Damnation; or in Justice and Mercy, and so he rewards Believers; in Justice, both in respect of Christs meriting Reward for such,

such, and that God having promised a Reward, will his Justice perform it; but this is still also in Mercy, in respect of *our selves*, deserving no such Reward, and the *moving Cause*, which was merely his own good Pleasure. Again, the Reward here is not promised to the *Work*, but to the *Person*; and 'tis not said *for his Works*, as noting any *Cause* of his Reward, but according to his *Works*; for there are many other Rewards, Temporal and Spiritual, which God may in some respect proportion to Mens Virtues and Zeal, tho yet, *Eternal Life*, which beyond all such Proportion, be freely bestowed for the *done Merit* of Christ, which being Infinite, is only of an *adequate Value* thereunto. And 'tis plain, *Moses* had respect to the Recompence of Reward upon Gods Promise made, and not upon the merit of his own doing, for it makes not his *own* All the procurer of the Recompence, but the *certainly* of the Recompence the *Excitement* to the Work.

Q. Tho we are not to expect *Justification* by the Law, or our own Righteousness, are we not yet with all Diligence to practice and press after Holiness, Righteousness, and the study of good Works?

A. Yes, by all means, for *without Holiness no man shall see God*; and therefore, when the Apostle argueth vehemently against Justification by the Works of the Law, yet he doth press the *Duty* of the Law,—*Do we then void the law through faith; God forbid, yea, we establish the law*, Rom. 3. 21. The Law continueth as a *Rule*, not as a *Covenant*, tho not appointed to Justify, yet commanded as the *Way* we should walk in, because Gods Order is to communicate the Benefits of Christs Righteousness to none but such as shall by Faith receive him, and walk obediently in his Commands; he hath freely and graciously promised Rewards far beyond our best Works, but the same are not to be bestowed on those who stand Idle, or Imploy themselves in Evil, but on the

in his Vineyard. 'Tis a grand and most unjust Calumny of the Romanists, That the Protestant Doctrine reflects or condemns Good Works; for there is no Church in the World that more earnestly presses People to an holy Life and Conversation, than the Church of England, and that too upon true solid Scripture-grounds. And whatever the Church of Rome may boast in this matter; one main reason why we reject several of her Doctrines, as Purgatory, Indulgences, &c. is, because they apparently tend to looseness of Life, and not to that serious Mortification and real Godliness, which the Christian Religion in its Purity requires.

Q. What is meant by Works of Supererogation?

A. Doing of some good Works more than by the Law is required at our hands, and thereby putting as it were an Obligation on Almighty God; for those that hold that Doctrine, distinguish Gods Commands from Evangelical Counsels. The former they make necessary, but the doing of the latter (amongst which they place their Vows of single Life, Poverty, regular Obedience, &c.) highly meritorious; for that, a man is not bound to do such things; and therefore they think that such as do them, shall have greater Glory in Heaven, and insinuate as if they (or at least the Church for them) could Transfer such their Merits, and thereby help others.

Q. Are there any such Supererogating Works?

A. None at all; *How shall a man be just with God, if he will contend with him?* Job 9. 2. *When you have done all, yet, We are unprofitable servants,* Luke 17. 10. This Opinion debases the Law of God, rendering it imperfect, by preferring the performance of Counsels, to the fulfilling thereof: If no man be able (as appears by the Texts which we have formerly cited) exactly to fulfil the Law, much less is he able to fulfil that which is heavier than the Law; besides, to beg daily for Pardon of our Sins,

Sins, and yet to boast of such Works, are things inconsistent.

Q. But what say you to those Texts, *Match. 19. 12. There be Eunuchs which have made themselves Eunuchs for a Kingdom of God. He that is able to receive it, let him receive.* Is not here a Counsel to a single Life, beyond a Command? So in *v. 21. If thou wilt be perfect, sell all that thou hast and give to the poor: Is not here a Counsel to a voluntary Poverty?*

A. Divine Counsels are *Commands*, and cannot be despised without Sin and Punishment, — *Psal. 107. 11. Prov. 1. 25. Luke 7. 30.* and accordingly the Texts you quoted, are to be understood, they are *Commands* in the particular, and given only to certain Persons, according to the Exigency of their Condition and Gifts. In the first Text, single Life is not only counselled, but *commanded* on two Conditions, if the Kingdom of Heaven doth so require it, and if one be assured of the Gift of Continency; now every man is bound to avoid all hindrances in his passage to Heaven, according to the Word of Christ, *If thy Eye offend thee, pluck it out, &c.* So he that hath the gift of Continency, and knows that Marriage would hinder him, must make himself an Eunuch, not literally (as *Origen* is said to have mistaken it) but live (as an Eunuch) *unmarried*: And this is not by way of Counsel, but as a *Duty* to further his own Salvation: so likewise in a large Discourse, in *1 Cor. 7. single Life* is enjoined to them that have the gift of Continency, not *Simply*, but because it was expedient in those times of Difficulty and Persecution.

Neither is the second Text a Counsel, but a *Command* given to the young Man, who had answered more arrogantly than truly and gave false Testimony of himself, that he kept all the *Commandments* from his youth up, when he was apparently *Covetous*, *Mark 10. 22.* To suppress

his excess of Pride, and to try and discover his Folly, Christ thus speaks to him; and not to set out a new Doctrine, or way to Perfection, not contained in the Law.

Q. What is the Sum of the Law?

A. To Love the Lord our God with all our heart, and our Neighbour as our selves, *Matth. 22. 37.* which is more particularly branched out into four Precepts in the *first Table*, and six in the *second Table* of the *Decalogue*, or *Ten Commandments*.

Q. How are we to understand those words of the First Commandment; *Thou shalt have no other Gods before me?*

A. That we ought not to pay Religious Worship to any being whatsoever, but to the Lord *Jehovah*; wherein is condemned; not only the renouncing or neglecting to worship the true God; and worshipping something else, altogether in His stead; but also, the admitting of any thing else to have a share with him in our Worship: For whoever religiously worships any thing that is not the true God, is said to have other Gods before, that is, in the presence of, or (as some Versions read it) besides the Lord: Because, tho there be really no other God but He, yet whatsoever other Beings we worship, we thereby make the same our God; Religious Worship being solely appropriated to the Almighty. *Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and serve him; Deut. 6. 13.* which words by our Saviour's own Interpretation, *Matth. 4. 10.* signify no less than *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve*; Which general Prohibition excludes not only the *Devilish Idols* of the *Gentiles*, but all other Creatures; how excellent soever, from all Religious Worship; of which indeed there can be but one kind, since there is but one only lawful Object thereof, which is God blessed for ever.

Q. May we not then worship or pray to Angels, or Saints departed?

A. No;

A. No; Prayer is an Act of Religious Worship, therefore due only to Almighty God, who alone calls our Prayers, and none but he is able to supply our need. *Call upon me in the day of trouble,* Psal. 50. 15. *If ye lack wisdom, let him ask it of God, who giveth to all liberally, &c.* And therefore to him only the Scriptures teach us to direct our Prayers. *When ye pray, say, Our Father which art in Heaven, &c.* Luke 11. 2. There is the least Command, nor one approved Example of praying to any other, whether Angel or Saint, in the whole Law of God.

Secondly, As for worshipping of Angels, we are expressly caution'd against it; Col. 2. 18. *Let no man beguile you in a voluntary humility, and worshipping of Angels:* but accordingly good Angels have always refused to accept or admit of any Adoration, or Worship, Revel. 19. 10. and Chap. 22. 8. Touching that Text, Gen. 48. 10. *The Angel which redeemed me from all Evil, bless the Lads.* but read the Verse before-going, you will find, that it is not any Created Angel Jacob there intends (for such an one could not be called the God before whom Abraham was nor redeem Jacob out of all Evil) but the Lord Christ, who is called the Angel of the Covenant, Mal. 3. 1. So in the following words, *Let my Name be named upon them* [the *Humanists* will have it *invoked* on them, and thence would ridiculously suggest, that the good Patriarch bespoke himself to be prayed unto after his decease] the Sense is more, than that Jacob adopted those Children of Israel born in Egypt, as *His*; that they should have their Name from him, and be reckon'd for two Tribes amongst his Posterity, as if they had been his immediate Children.

Thirdly, Praying to Saints departed, is not only vain and to no purpose, since those that use it cannot see how 'tis possible, or so much as probable, that the Saints should know their Prayers: And the Scriptures seem

each the contrary; (the Dead know nothing more) Eccles. 9. 5. that is, none of the Transactions of this lower World: So Job 14. 21. speaking of the Dead, saith, (*Whether his Children shall be Noble or Ignoble, he shall not understand:*) But the same is very dangerous, because *Omniscience* and *Omnipresence*, which be God's peculiar Attributes, are by this practice consequentially ascribed to those Creatures, at least by the natural tendency of the *Action*, tho perhaps the Worshipper does not apprehend it so; For how else (for Example) shall the Blessed Virgin *MARY* hear a thousand Suppliants, in a thousand different Places, calling upon her for several things at one and the same instant?

Fourthly, We must pray to none but to whom we may do it in faith, *without doubting*; and upon good grounds believing that *we shall obtain*, Matth. 21. 22. Jam. 1. 5. But what Faith can we have in a Practice uncommanded, nay *prohibited* by God? What Faith when we are not, nay cannot be sure that the Saints do hear our Prayers? much less that they will, or can, grant them? We do not believe in Angels or Saints, Therefore *how shall we call on them on whom we have not believed?* Rom. 10. 14.

Fifthly, The same is injurious to the Honour of *Christ*, who is our sole Mediator, not only of *Redemption*, but of *intercession* too, Rom. 8. 34. Heb. 7. 25. He is our great and only Advocate in the Court of Heaven; who hath not only both *invited* and commanded us to apply our selves to none but him, but graciously promised to answer us: John 14. 6. *No man comes to the Father but by me*: And v. 3. *Whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, I will do it*.

To evade the force of these Arguments, the *Romanists* wonderfully puzzle themselves; sometimes they alledge, They give not the Honour due to God, to these glorious Creatures; and to that purpose they invent distinctions, where there is no difference, as between *Latria*, and *Du-*

his; and tell us of Religious Worship, *Suprem* and *Subordinate*, *Absolute* and *Relative*, *Terminative* and *Transfusive*. But we have proved before, That there is but one Object of Religious Worship, and so the same can be but one kind; (tho Civil Honours may be various, because Objects are so, as one sort of Respect is paid to a Father, another to our Prince, another to a subordinate Magistratus, &c.) and so all this smokes vanishes.

Sometimes they pretend they honour the Saints in Heaven, as they do good men on Earth, and only pray them for the assistance of their Prayers, and that God by some means makes known such their Prayers to the Saints. To this I answer, 1st, That this Pretence is contrary to the Practice; For in their ordinary Prayers, Praises and Thanksgivings, they most commonly join the Virgin Mary with God, *Jesu-Maria!* coming in one word out of their Mouths; and *Glory be to God, and to the Blessed Virgin*; with them, makes but one compleat Doxology. 2^{dly}, Besides the vast difference between desiring the Prayers of a good Man on Earth, and praying to some in Heaven, (for the former of which we have Precept and various Examples, but none of the latter) I say, this Suggestion is contrary to their Council of Trent, which *Sess. 25.* declares, That 'tis good and profitable (it seem themselves thought it not necessary) *suppliciter Invenire*, as 'humble Suppliants to call upon the Saints, who join together with Christ; and to fly not only to their Prayers, but help and assistance too, for obtaining benefits from God, through his Son Jesus Christ our Lord; who is our only (they would not say *Intercessor*, but) *Redeemer and Saviour*. 3^{dly}. If the Saints cannot know our Prayers till God acquaints them therewith. As for Example, When a Roman Catholic Seaman prays to St. Nicholas (the reputed tutelary Saint of that Profession) to preserve him from Shipwrack, God must signify first to St. Nicholas who it is calls on him, and for what, before the Saint can

use any Intercession in the Affair; why then should not the poor Creature much rather go immediately to God, whom he is sure the Winds and the Seas obey? Is God less kind and merciful than the Saints?

To help themselves out here, they say 'tis more *humble* to go to God by the good Offices of the *Saints*, than rudely to press in upon the Divine Majesty: As when we have to do with a Prince, we get some *Favourite* to facilitate our Admission, and present our *Petition*: But this Comparison is dishonourable to the *Almighty*; *His ways are not as the ways of Men, nor his thoughts as their thoughts.* The best and greatest of Princes, tho Analogically called *Gods*, are yet really but *Men*; To whom we cannot speak, when, and where we would: But to God, who is every-where, and always present, we may: Man, perhaps, sometimes through *Pride* will not, or through *Carelessness* regards not, or through *Ignorance* knows not, or through *Business* cannot redress the *Grievances* of such as sue unto him; or his *Attendants* may keep off Petitioners, and not allow them Access; but there are no such Impediments in God, therefore no such need of making an Interest in Saints to address or pray to him; *Thou art a God bearing Prayers, therefore to thee shall all Flesh come.*

Lastly, They alledg, That their praying to *Saints* is not injurious to God or Christ, because they pray not to them, as to God, but address their Prayers only as to his *Mother*, his *Friends*, and his *Favourites*, whom they suppose to intercede only in *his name* and mediation, — Well! But if Prayer be an Act of Religious Worship, and so due only to God, you ought not to offer it to any Creature, tho never so much a *Friend*: For suppose a *married Woman* accused of lying every night with her Neighbour, not able to deny the Fact, should go about to justify it, by maintaing that the Act is not *Adultery*, because she never lies with him as her *Husband*, but always as her *dear Husband's special Friend*, and near Relation; would such a Plea

be accepted in any sober Judicatory? 'Tis the sole and proper Office of the Lord Jesus to offer up the Prayers of his People; To be our *Advocate with the Father*, 1 John 2.1. And to appear in the presence of God for us, Heb. 9. 24. Therefore to apply our selves to any other Mediators in Heaven to present our Prayers to God, in what manner, or upon what pretence soever it be, is highly derogatory to the Honour and Office of the Blessed Jesus.

I shall only add, That the Invocation of *Angels* was by the Council of *Laodicea* (about the Year 360.) expressly condemned, and branded with the Title of *Idolatry*: That many of the *Fathers* were of opinion, that the Souls of Saints are not at present admitted to the *Beatified Vision*, but reserved in certain Apartments in the enjoyment of Peace, and Rest, till the General *Resurrection*; on which Notion, they were so far from praying to them, that they did pray for them, and beg of God their further Bliss and Consummation: And whereas certain Women, near the Year 403. were wont to offer up *Cakes* in honour of the Blessed Virgin (whence they were called *Colliridiani*) *Epiphanius* mentioning them under the Character of *Heresies*, thus reproves them, *Let Mary be in honour, but let the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost be worshipped*; and no less than six times repeats these words, *Μαζιας μωδω*, *Let no man worship or adore Mary.*

Q. I confess 'tis very strange, That whereas neither *Patriarchs*, nor *Prophets*, nor *Apostles*, or any *Apostolical Holy men*, in all their dangers or distresses, ever prayed to, or worshipped any Creature whatsoever, either *Holy Angel*, or *Holy Soul*, yet the Church of *Rome* (at least in vulgar practice) comparatively prays to, and worships nothing so much, or frequently, as is manifest by their very *Beads* (the new Engines and measures of their perfunctory Devotion) where there are ten *Ave Maria's*, for each *Pater Noster*! — But let us proceed: Doth not the *second Commandment* forbid all Religious Adoration,

and Worship, outward or inward, to be given to any *Images* of God, or of the Saints, or of any Creature?

A. Yes assuredly! its words are plain, *Thou shalt not make to thy self any graven Image, or any likeness of any thing in Heaven above, or that is in the Earth beneath, or that is in the water under the Earth: thou shalt not bow down to them, nor serve them, &c.* This Commandment forbids all *Images* in Divine Worship and Religious use; for as the first Commandment forbids *False gods*, so this (in its primary sense) the worshipping the true God by *false means*, as *Images*, &c. and prohibits all manner of Religious worship and honour of them, whether absolutely, or Relatively, mediately or ultimately; for it saith, *Thou shalt not bow down to them, nor serve them*; intimating, that the prohibited worship of *Images* consisteth in two things, first *Adoration*, as by uncovering the Head, bowing of the Body, bending of the Knee, Kissing, and such like Gestures; 2ly, In any kind of *Religious service*, as when they are trimmed up with Gold, Silver, and Jewels, when *Incense* is burnt to them, and they set on high places; when *Vows* are made to them, when honoured with *Pilgrimages*, Oblations, Wax-candles, Tapers, and other such like Ceremonies.

Q. Do the *Romanists* in any of their *Catechisms* leave out the Second Commandment?

A. Yes, in divers; I will shew you one Entituled, *A Catechism or Summary of Christian Doctrine set out by the command of Cardinal de Retz, Bishop of Paris*; and in *Bellarmin*; the first Translated into *English* by *G. J.* and Printed (Clandestinely) for *T. D.* 1673, where Page 23d the second Lesson is in these words:

Q. How shall we make it appear that we love God?

A. By obeying his Commandments?

Q. How many are these Commandments, and what are they?

- A. I. *Pou shall adore one God, and love him perfectly.*
- II. *Pou shall not take his Name in vain.*
- III. *Pou shall keep holy the Sabbath-day, serving God devoutly.*
- IV. *Pou shall honour your Father and Mother, that you may live long.*
- V. *Pou shall not kill, nor have a will to do it.*
- VI. *Pou shall not give way to any luxurious Act, nor consent to it in thought.*
- VII. *Pou shall not steal, nor retain any thing that belongs to another.*
- VIII. *Pou shall not bear false witness, or give any way to lying.*
- IX. *Pou shall not covet your Neighbours Wife, nor any thing against Chastity.*
- X. *Pou shall not covet your Neighbours Goods of any kind.*

Here you see the Second Commandment omitted wholly, and because the people would not be satisfied without *Ten*, the Tenth is divided into *Two*; though that which they here make the *Ninth*, is the same with the *Sixth*; so that to colour this Sacrilegious suppression of one of Gods Commandments, they are forced not only to alter the words of every Commandment, written by the *Finger of God*, but also to represent *Infinite Wisdom* as guilty of *Tautology*.

So in the *Hours of our Lady*, Printed at Paris Anno 1611, the Commandments of the first Table are set down in these words, and no other.

First Commandment.

I am the Lord thy God, thou shalt not have any worship any other God but me.

Second Commandment.

Thou shalt not take the Name of the Lord thy God, in vain.

Third Commandment.

Remember to keep Holy the Sabbath-day and Feasts, &c.

The like Artifice may be seen in a Book published in French by *Francis Coster*, Entituled *Chrétiens Instruions*, lib. 3. Cap. 3.

Q. It is not difficult to guess the design of this foul practice; but was not this Commandment Ceremonial and proper only to the *Israelites*? or at least, are not *Idols*, or the Images of *False gods* only forbidden here?

A. First, this Commandment is part of the *Moral Law*; and cannot be *Ceremonial* or binding to the *Jews* only, because the Reason of it is immutable; and the same is so far from being Repealed, that it is ratified in the Gospel, *Rom. 1. 23, & 25.* 2ly, Every Image, Picture, or Statue, made for Religious Worship, is an Idol, whether of false gods, or pretended to represent the true God.

Q. How doth this appear?

A. Even by the Exposition of this Command by *Moser* himself: For thus he saith, *Deut. 4. 12.* The Lord spake unto you, ye heard the voice, but saw no similitude, only heard the voice, Take ye therefore good heed (for ye saw no manner of similitude) lest you corrupt your selves, and make you a Graven Image, the similitude of any Figure, &c. Whence 'tis evident, the Second Commandment forbids the worshipping the true God by Images; for his Argument is, That God did therefore forbear to shew himself in any visible shape at the delivery of the Law; to the end that it might be better known, that the worshipping of Images, not only as they have reference to the *Creatures*, or false gods, but also as (in the intention of the makers) they might have relation to himself, did come within the compals of *Idol-*

latry. The Scripture in sundry places attests, that those who erect Images to God, and in and by them worship God, are guilty of Horrible Idolatry: Thus the *Israelites* by making a *Golden Calf*, committed Idolatry; they could not be so silly, as to think that the *Calf* which they made, was the God that brought them up out of *Egypt*; but because the *Egyptians* worshipped their false gods by an Hieroglyphic Representation in the shape of an *Ox*, they would worship *Jehovah* in like manner, as appears by the very words of the Text, *Exod. 32. 5.* *Aaron* after he had made a *Golden Calf*, he built an altar before it, and made Proclamation, and said, *To morrow is a Feast to the Lord* (*Jehovah*.) So *Micah* made an Image in Honour of *Jehovah*, *Judg. 17. 3, 13.* *I had wholly dedicated the Silver unto the Lord* (*Jehovah*.) *Now I know that the Lord* (*Jehovah*) *will do me good, because I have a Levite to my Priest.* Nay, *Jeroboam's Calves* were made to represent, not false gods, but *Jehovah*; for so we read, *1 King. 12. 18.* *Behold thy Gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the Land of Egypt.* But so far is the Almighty and Jealous God from accepting such worship, that he declares in his Word, that those who worship him by Images, are indeed *Worshippers of the Devil*; *They provoked him to Jealousie with strange gods, they sacrificed unto Devils,* *Deut. 32. 17.* *They made a Calf in those days, and sacrificed to the Idol,* *Act. 7. 41.* Where the *Golden Calves* are called *Idols*, and the *Israelites* are said to sacrifice to *Devils*, which is not to be understood of the judgment and intention of the men worshipping them, as if they did design to worship *Devils* and false gods by them; but of the truth of the thing, and of the judgment of God, testifying, That such worship being contrary to his command, did displease him, and had the *Devil* for its Author, and so (whatever they intended) was indeed the worshipping of *Devils* and false gods.

¶ We know (saith St. Paul; 1 Cor. 8: 4.) That *nothing* in the world; whence it should seem; that *Idols* are of things really existent, but *Idols* of things not existent, viz. such as never had any being in the World; and consequently that the *Pictures* of God, Christ, the *Virgin Mary*, *Saints*, &c. tho religiously made, kept, or adored, cannot be *Idols*?

1st, St. Paul speaks not in reference to the *Object* which is represented, but in respect to the *Virtue* and *Efficacy* of *Idols*, which indeed is *nothing*. 2^{dly}, We know that the *Heathens* had *Idols* not only of some things *imagined*; but also of things *truly existent*. 3^{dly}, The *Images* of God, and the *Blessed Trinity*, *Christ*, &c. are *Lies*; in Gods glorious and incomprehensible *Nature*, cannot be represented to Men by any *Image*, but in a way of infinite *Disparagement* to him; nor *Christ*; for he is both *God* and *Man*; and if they mean it only of his *Body*; from whence should they have the true *Effigies*? There being no *Images*, nor *Pictures* thereof, until many hundred years after his *Death* and *Ascension*; and those *Pictures* they now have, are not *alike* in *Shape*, *Lineaments* or *Colours*; and as for the *Saints* (not mentioning some abroad, that never were, as St. *Christopher*, &c.) it is unbecoming these *glorified Spirits* to represent them in dull and *senseless Images*.

¶ The Honour of God seems to require the *Worship* of his *Image*; for that redounds to God; as he that honours his *Prince*, will honour his *Picture*; and we shew our reverence to the *King*, by being uncovered in the *Private Chamber*, tho the *King* be absent.

¶ I have shew'd, That we ought not to make any *Image* of God; and as to the *Comparison*, I say, If a *King* forbid any *Picture* of himself to be made or set up, and any *over-officious* Subject should notwithstanding set up the *Kings Picture*, pretending to do it in respect to the *King*; the *King* would undoubtedly esteem himself not
honoured,

honoured, but highly dishonoured thereby, since his Commands are broken, and his Authority violated and despised. Again, if a King require such Reverence to be given to his Presence Chamber, it's fit it should be obeyed, (seeing it is only a *Civil*, not religious Worship.) But since God has severely forbidden any Religious Worship to be given to any Images or Pictures, there is good reason that his Prohibition should be obeyed too. Nor does any more dishonour redound to God, from our *slighting* or destroying those Images which he forbids, than pretended to represent him, than would to the King, by cutting to pieces a piece of *Adulterate Money*, wherein (the better to deceive) false Traytors had stamped the *Royal Effigies*.

Q. But perhaps you have all this while combated only a *Shadow*; tho some Christians use Images as *Remembrances*, to put them in mind of God, Christ, or holy Saints, yet how do you know that there are any that make these *Objects* of Worship, or think to Worship God, Christ, or the Saints *in* or *by* them?

A. Not only the *Practices* of thousands daily before our Eyes, in several parts of Europe, may assure us thereof. But the second Council of Nice, and that of Trem, do command the worshipping of Images: For thus says the last, Sess. 25. *The Images of Christ, and of the Virgin Mother of God, and other Saints, are to be had and retained, especially in Churches, and to them due Honour and Veneration is to be given; [but what that is, they would not declare, only add,] Not that there is believed any Divinity or Power to be in them, [the Images themselves] for which they are to be worshipt, or any thing desired of them, or any way imposed in them, as the Gentiles of old did, who placed their Hope in Idols; but because the Honour which is exhibited to them, redounds to their Prototypes [or Originals] which they Represent; so by the Images which we Kiss, and before which we bow our Knees, we adore Christ, and reverence*

of Saints whose Similitude they bear.— By which Words is evident, the Council retains not Images as Remembrances, merely to put us in mind, (as some would persuade us) but for *Worship*, which they Justify, because the same refers to their *Originals*. But still, what is all this to the Second Commandment, which absolutely forbids all Worship of Images, without any such Limitation? The Heathens themselves never were so fond as to think their *very Images* were *Gods*; but referred the Worship they paid to them, to their *Prototypes*, as well as the Papists. Moreover; why does the Church of Rome solemnly *Consecrate* Images? Why do they fancy greater Efficacy in one Image, (as suppose that of the Virgin at *Loretto*, or St. *James* at *Compostella*) than another of the same Saint at Home? Besides, *Azorius* in his *Moral Instructions*, affirms it is the constant Opinion of Divines (that is of the Church of Rome) 'That an Image is to be honoured and worshipped with the same honour and worship which is given to him whose Image it is. And *Bellarmin* in his Treatise on this Subject, expressly disputes for this, 'That Images are not only to be worshipped as Exemplars, but also properly and by themselves, so as the worship may be terminated in them; and consequently an Image of God or Christ, may be worshipped with the same Adoration as we pay to God himself; and indeed, this is the true Notion of worshipping of Images, that they are Proxies or legal Representatives, and so must receive the same Honour as their Prototypes.

2. However, Images are Lay-mens Books,

As Our *Laitie* (God be prais'd,) have the *Holy Bible*, and other better Books to instruct them; for want of which, not a few poor Souls abroad, have made those *Idols* *Blocks*, not only their Books, but their Gods; and what kind of Books these Idols are, and what Doctrine they teach, we may read *Jeremiah* 10. 14, 15. Every

man

man is brutish in his knowledge, every founder is consumed by the graven Image; for his molten Image is falsehood; and as there is no breath in them, they are vanity, and the works of men; in the time of their visitation they shall perish. Hab. 2. 18. What profiteth the graven Image, that the maker thereof hath graven it: the molten Image, a teacher of lies, that the maker thereof trusteth therein, to make dumb Idols? Wo unto him that saith to the Wood, Awake; and to the dumb Stone, It shall Teach.

Q. What is Prayer?

A. 'It is a Religious fiducial calling upon God in the Name of Christ with the Heart, and sometimes with the Voice, according to his Will, for our selves and others, consisting of Confession of Sin, Petition for Grace, and giving of thanks.

Q. Should any Person use Prayers that they do not understand? Or the publick Prayers and Services of God in the Church, be performed in a Tongue Unknown, or not understood by the People?

A. No; such Practices are but a Prophanation of the religious Duty; and indeed, no more than vain babbling. The very Essence of Prayer consisting in the hearty concurrence of the Understanding and Will; whence God complains, *This People draweth nigh to me with their lips, but their hearts are far from me*; and requires that we pray *with the spirit, and with the understanding also*, 1 Cor. 14. 15, throughout; which whole Chapter St. Paul prophetically argues against Praying and Speaking in an Unknown Language in the Church, even in those on whom the Gift of Tongues was miraculously conferred.

Q. Is it Lawful, or our Duty, to pray for the Dead?

A. No. For 1st, whatsoever is done without faith, is sin, Rom. 14. 23. But for praying for the Dead, we have no Command from God, nor Promise to be heard, nor Example in Holy Scripture; and consequently, cannot do it in Faith. 2^{dly}, Such Prayers are vain and unprofitable.

Tablet: Now the child is dead, why should I fast and pray? As David, 2 Sam. 12. 21. As the tree falleth, so it lieth; and as Death leaves Man, so will Judgment find him; they that dye in the Lord, are blessed, Rev. 14. 13. and need not our Prayers; and those that dye in their sins, can have no benefit by them, for out of Hell there is no Redemption.

Q. But I suppose, this practice of praying for the Dead, depends on the Notion of a third Place, called *Purgatory*. What, I pray, is thereby meant?

A. I will answer you in the Words of their before cited Catechism—'It is a place where Souls departed out of this World in the Grace of God, must make Satisfaction for the temporal Sins for which they have not here fully satisfied:—For they teach that, altho God freely gives to all that are in a *State of Grace*, [that is, *Confessed* and *Absolved*] forgiveness of the *Guilt* of all their mortal Sins, and freedom from Eternal Death; yet Satisfaction must notwithstanding be made for the temporal Punishment due to those Sins; wherefore, and for as much also, as Persons have much *venial* Sin and Corruption, in which they often-times dye, therefore it is necessary that they should for the *Expiation* of those Sins, and for the Satisfaction of Gods Justice, as to the temporal Punishments of the other, either *do* or *suffer* such Penances, *Fastings*, *Prayers*, &c. as may effect the same here; or where those are not sufficiently performed, suffer the Pains of *Purgatory*; where (as in a Prison) they must remain in grievous Tortures, till they have made full Satisfaction, and are compleatly *Purged*; and then they are admitted into *Heaven*, which Release may be hastened, or their Pains mitigated, either by the Good Works of their surviving Friends, as by their *Prayers*, *Alms*, and procuring *Masses* to be said; or by *Indulgences* obtained from the Pope.

Q. What is to be thought of this Doctrine?

A. That it is altogether built upon the Sand, and invented for secular Ends.

For 1st, 'tis grounded on several false Doctrines, that some Sins are *venial*; that Good Works merit of God, and those of the *Living*, avail for the *Dead*, &c. all which are refuted before.

2^{dly}, It is highly *Derogatory* to the Honour of Christ to say, That men are purged by suffering Pains in Purgatory, whereby they satisfy for *lesser* Sins, and for the temporal Punishment of the *greater* Sins; for the Blood of Christ is the only Purgatory of all our Sins, Heb. 1. 3. *When he had by himself purged our sins, sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high;* and Ch. 9. 14. *How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal spirit offers himself without spot to God, purge your consciences from dead works to serve the living God?* Whence he is called, a *ransom* for all, 1 Tim. 2. 6. Christ is a *complete Saviour*, his Blood cleanseth us from all sin, 1 Joh. 1. 7. He is able (and sure he is no less willing) to save to the utmost those that come to him, Heb. 7. 25.

Thirdly, The Scriptures teach us no such *Middle Place* of Souls after Death; as Purgatory; but the quite contrary, 2 Cor 4. 18. *The things which are seen, are Temporal; but the things which are not seen, are Eternal:* Whence it follows, That there is no Place or State after this Life which is not *Everlasting*, therefore no Purgatory. Again, the Apostle saith, *That the whole Church, all the Family wherof Christ is Head, is either in Heaven, or upon the Earth* Eph. 1. 10. *That in the fulness of time he might gather together in one, all things in Christ, both which are in Heaven, and which are on Earth.* And Chap. 3. 15. speaking of Christ, he saith—*Of whom the whole Family in Heaven and Earth is named:* John 5. 24. *Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting Life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from*

and life: If he come not into condemnation, he
not be cast into a Place of punishment.

Fourthly, 'Tis said, *Rev. 14. 13. Blessed are the Dead that die in the Lord, for they rest from their Labours, &c.* Where
is, there is no Torment, Ergo, no Purgatory; at least
if any did ever need satisfactory-purgation after death,
sure that *Thief*, who was converted upon the Cross, ought
to have suffered the Pains of Purgatory many years; yet
the Lord saith to him— *This day shalt thou be with me in
Paradise*, Luke 23. 43.

Fifthly, Were it necessary that Believers must satisfy
God after death for temporal Punishments, arrear, and
for lesser (venial) Sins, then such of them as shall be *alive*
upon Earth at Christ's second Coming, must first go into
Purgatory, before they can meet the Lord in the Air, 1 Thess.
4. 17.

Sixthly, Since they own the *Apocryphal Books* for Cano-
nical, what will they say to that of *Wisdom 3. 1. The Souls
of the Righteous are in the hand of God, and there shall no Tor-
ment touch them*; — Is not this one Text alone enough to
quench the Fire of Purgatory for ever?

Q. *Whosoever shall speak against the Holy Ghost, it shall not
be forgiven him, neither in this World, nor in that which is
to come*, *Matth. 12. 31.* Therefore it seems there is some
commission of Sins in the *World to come*, which cannot be
done in *Heaven*, or *Hell*, therefore must be in *Purga-
tory*?

A. 'Tis Childish from two Negatives to infer an Affirma-
tive; as if one should argue, *Peter* neither in this World,
nor in the World to come, shall be made an Angel; Ergo,
he shall be made Angels in the World to come: The words
signify no more than this, That that Sin shall never be re-
mited: And so is interpreted, *Mark 3. 29.* He that blas-
phemeth against the Holy Ghost, hath never forgiveness; &
Luke 12. 10. *It shall not be forgiven.*

Q. *He shall be saved, yet so as by fire,* 1 Cor. 3. 15. What is this spoken of *Purgatory*?

A. Not in the least; For 'tis plain, this is the Fire intended, v. 13. which cannot be that of *Purgatory*. 1st, Because 'tis the Fire of the Day of Judgment, which *Purgatory*, by those that maintain it, is confess'd to be. 2^{dly}, This Fire burns the *Works* of Men only, their *Hay* and *Stubble*, not their *Persons*, as *Purgatory* is supposed to do. 3^{dly}, This Fire tries both *Good* and *Bad*, all pass through it, the *Gold* and *Silver* no less than the *Hay* and *Stubble*; The Text is only a figurative way of speaking frequent in Scripture, and common use; As the deliver'd *Jews* are said to be as *Fire-brands* pluck'd out of the burning *Amos* 4. 11. So here, *He shall be saved, yet so as by fire*, that is, not without difficulty; and the Fire shall consume as much of his *Works* as was *Hay* and *Stubble*, so that he shall lose that part of his Reward.

Q. You mentioned but a while ago *Indulgences*; tell me, I pray, what are they?

A. A late worthy *Author*, no less truly than wisely, calls them *The Moral to the Fable of Purgatory*: For you must know, that the Church of *Rome* teaches, 1st, That there have been, and are, divers *Saints*, who not only merit for themselves, but a great deal to spare; all whose superabounding *Merits* are repositied into one *Treasure*. 2^{dly}, That these *Merits* are applicable to others; so that God will pardon *Peter*, for Example, as to the deserved punishment of his Sin, for the *Merits* of *Stephen*. 3^{dly}, God hath put this *Treasure* into the Church's, that is, the *Pope's* hands; and from him the disposal thereof is delegated in such proportions, as he orders, unto the hands of all *Priests*, who thereby have a power to apply those *Merits* as they see fit; as by saying such, and so many *Masses* or *Prayers*, &c. which shall avail to mitigate the Pains, or wholly to release such or such a Soul from the Torments of *Purgatory*.

Q. What

Q. What say you to this Doctrine?

A. That there is nothing sound therein. For 1st, I have proved, that no meer Man can merit of God; The Wise Virgins had Oil little enough for themselves, and none to spare, Matth. 25. 9. 2^{dly}, That as none of us have any Merits to spare; so if they had, yet no Man's Merits (except Christ's) can be applied to another; Every man shall bear his own burthen, Gal. 6. 6. Every one shall receive according to what he has done in his Body. 3^{dly}, I have demonstrated, that there is no such Purgatory, and so the Foundation of these Indulgences is gone. Indeed if there were any such Treasury of Merits, and the Pope had the disposal thereof, he must be very uncharitable not to dispence it at a better rate. 'Tis an Evangelical Rule, *Freely ye have received, freely give*: Why then does his Holiness take Money for his Indulgences? why does he thus *Huckster* them out by Retail? and not rather generously enlarge it once all the poor Souls out of their Purgatory Torments?

Q. What do you mean by a Sacrament?

A. The word *Sacrament* is variously used by Authors both Prophane and Ecclesiastical; sometimes for an Oath in general, sometimes for that particular Oath Souldiers entred into at their *Lifting*; sometimes for any sacred Mystery, or Religious Secret, not to be commonly divulged; Or for that, whereby any thing Divine was represented, shadowed out, or signified: But in a strict and special sense, the word is by Christian Writers, and the use of the Church, appropriated to those Signs of Grace, whereby God seals to us the Benefit of his Promises, and binds us to a mutual Testification of the Covenant entred into with him: So that by Sacrament here, I mean, *An holy Ordinance, consisting of an outward visible Sign of an inward Spiritual Grace given to us, ordained by Christ himself, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof; Or a Divine Institution in the Gospel, wherein by sen-*
F *sible*

sible Signs, Christ, and the Benefits of the New Covenant, represented, sealed, and applied to Believers.

Q. How many Sacraments are there of the New Testament?

A. Two; *Baptism*, and the *Lord's Supper*; and no more.

Q. Are not *Confirmation*, *Penance*, *Matrimony*, *Order*, and *Extream Unction*, Sacraments?

A. No; Not in the proper sense before explained for as such, there are five Conditions required to a Sacrament of the Gospel. 1st, That it be instituted by Christ himself immediately. 2^{dly}, That it have some visible Sign. 3^{dly}, That it have the Promise of God concerning *Saving Grace* and *Eternal Life* added to the Sign. 4^{thly}, That it represent, seal, and apply Christ, and the Benefits of the New Covenant to Believers. 5^{thly}, That it be given to the whole Church, to continue to the end of the World; all which agree only to *Baptism*, and the *Lord's Supper*; nor were any other esteemed as proper Sacraments of the Gospel by the Primitive Churches, or Fathers. *Peter Lombard*, the Schoolman, who flourished about the Year 1143. being the first man that ever put the number *Seven*; nor was the same established by any Council, till that of *Florence*, which ended, but in the Year 1439. Therefore tho with *Antiquity* we do not own the other Five as proper Sacraments, yet as to the things themselves, The Protestant Church of England retains and makes use of them (all but one) to such good ends and purposes as they serve for; — For, as touching *Confirmation*, see the Office appointed for it in the *Litany*, which duly observed, does tend much more to the promoting of Knowledge and Godliness, than as 'tis practised in the Church of Rome; where, if I am not misinformed, it is (at least sometimes) administered to *Infants*, not long after *Baptism*: But tho we use it as a laudable *Antient Rite*, we do not reckon it to be a Sacrament, because

and no such expresse Institution by our Saviour in the Gospel, as of *Baptism*, and the *Lord's Supper*, nor such promises made upon the use of it.

Nor do we attribute the Title of Sacrament to *Holy Orders*, since they belong only to one sort of Men, who are thereby devoted, not simply to *Christianity*, (for that was done at *Baptism*) but to the Work of the *Ministry*: And with what Gravity and Solemnity she confers Orders, appears in her Publick Forms appointed for that purpose. Touching *Marriage*, tho we grant that it carries a signification of the *Mystical Union* between Christ and his Church, as we are taught by *St. Paul*; And that it is an honourable state instituted by God in Paradise; yet do we not call it a *Sacrament*, for then a Sacrament of the Gospel would be common to *Heathens* as well as *Christians*; but with the Apostle, we judg it to be Honourable in all men, and particularly in *Priests* as well as other *Christians*, Saint *Paul* himself being a married man, and other of the Apostles, as *St. Paul* intimates; *Have not we power to lead about with us, a wife, as well as other Apostles and Cephas?* 1 Cor. 9. 5. *A Bishop must be blameless, the husband of one wife,* 1 Tim. 3. 2. *Their wives must be grave and sober,* 1 Tim. 3. 11. Forbidding to marry is branded as a *Doctrine of Devils*, 1 Tim. 4. 3. And we cannot but admire the Church of *Rome* should at the same time advance it to a *Sacrament*, and yet so severely forbid all her Clergy the use of it, and reckon them a more holy sort of persons that make *vows* against it.

As for *Penance*, tho we do not with the Church of *Rome* exact from men a particular Confession to the Priests, of all their private faults, as absolutely necessary to Salvation, nor send them on long *Pilgrimages*, to this, or the *Image*, nor to give themselves so many *Lashes*, or kneele over so many *Pater-Nosters*, or *Ave-Marys*; (which is nothing to amend the soul) yet we press them to the great duty of sincere Repentance and Reformation, without which they cannot be pardoned; and that they

should confess their sins to God, with shame and sorrow, and speedily and thoroughly *forſake* the ſame. And in ſome caſes of notorious, open, ſcandalous offences, a *Publick Penance* is injoined, and a general Confefſion and *Absolution* preſcribed in our Liturgy.

Touching *Extraneous Unction*, as 'tis practiſed in the Church of *Rome*, it has no warrant from Scripture, for the *Anointing* mentioned *Mark* 16. 13. or *Jam.* 5. 14. was intended for the health of the *body*, and the uſage ſeems to have ceaſed with the Gift of *Miracles*; but the *Extraneous Unction* of the *Romaniſts* is pretended for the benefit of the *ſoul*, and therefore not commonly uſed, till they perceive no hopes of recovery. For which Ceremony there is no command of God, ſo neither any promiſe of ſpiritual benefit thereby, but the ſame is attended with much *ſuperſtition*, and we fear betrays many poor ſouls to deſtruction.

Q. Doth the Efficacy of the *Sacraments* depend upon the Intention of the Miniſter?

A. No, the Ordinances of God depend not upon the Holineſs or intention of the perſon that doth adminiſter them, but upon the work of the Spirit; and the work of Inſtitution, containing a precept for the uſe of them, and a promiſe of benefit by them, *1 Cor.* 3. 7. Neither he that planteth any thing, nor he that watereth, but God giveth the increaſe. *Phil.* 1. 18. Notwithſtanding every way whether in preſence, or in truth, Chriſt is preached, I then rejoice. The *Romaniſts* by this Doctrine ſuſpend their Faith and Salvation upon great uncertainties. For as they hold, That they cannot be ſaved without *Baptiſm*: So they alſo hold, That *Baptiſm* is no *Baptiſm* if the Prieſt do not intend to make it a Sacrament. And how can they be ſure of the Prieſts intention? Nay thus, they cannot be ſure that they have any *Sacraments* or *Prieſts* among them; for they muſt be certain that he is a *Prieſt* who Conſecrates, and that he hath an Intention to make a

rament; but how can they be assured of his Priesthood? they must first be assured of the Priesthood of him that Baptized him, and of the intention of the Bishop that Ordained him, and of the intention of the Archbishop that Ordained that Bishop; all which is impossible; so that according to their own Principles, the people can have no certainty that they are Christians.

2. Do the Sacraments confer Grace by the *meer work* done, or Sacramental action?

A. We grant the Sacraments are not *meer signs*, but efficacious to work Grace, if they be rightly used, not by the *meer work* done, but by the power and operation of the Spirit, 1 Cor. 12. 13. Mat. 3. 11. As *Elisha's* bough made *Iron* swim, *Moses's* Rod divided the Red Sea, not by inherent force of it self, but by the power of God; nor is the efficacy of *Sacraments* ryed to that moment of time wherein they are administred, Job. 3. 8. but they become effectual means of Salvation to such only as by Faith receive them, 1 Pet. 3. 21. *Baptism* doth save, not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience. 1 Cor. 11. 28. Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of this bread, and drink of this cup. 'Tis false and absurd to think that the Sacramental Signs, as Water in Baptism, &c. when received, have in themselves inherent vertue to work and produce Grace, as *Physick* to cure, or fire to burn: For first, it's injurious to God, for he only who made the heart, can sanctifie it; the cleansing of the soul by Grace infused, being as great a work as Creation. 2ly, The Word preached doth not profit without Faith, therefore not the Sacraments. 3ly, Did the Sacrament confer Grace upon *Judas*, or did *Simon Magus* receive Grace by Baptism? *St. Peter* testifies to the contrary, Act. 8. 13. compar'd with v. 23.

2. What say you to the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* in the Sacrament of the Lords-Supper? Is the whole Substance of the Bread and Wine by the words of Consecra-

tion, converted into the Substance of the Body and Blood of Christ which was born of the Virgin Mary, and suffered upon the Cross?

A. The same is repugnant to Scripture as well as contrary to the nature of a Sacrament, weakens the credibility of the Christian Religion; was never thought much less believed by the Primitive Church for several hundred years; hath given occasion to many scandals and most gross Idolatry, and doth contain manifold contradictions and Absurdities.

Q. How then came so strange a notion to be entertained at first by any Christians?

A. *Abyssus Abyssum invocat*, one Error drew on another, you must know that in the beginning of the Eighth Century a fierce Dispute arose about Images; the Church of Rome and a Council held there, were for Images; but the Greek Church and a Council at Constantinople condemned them. The Popes were so hot and violent in this worthy quarrel, That Gregory the Second Excommunicated the Emperor *Philip*, and Gregory the Third the Emperor *Leo the Third*, because they opposed Images. And at last in the Second Council of Nice about the year 788. got Image-worship established. Now one of the great Arguments of the before-mentioned Synod of Constantinople, held in or about the year 757. against Images was this, *That our Lord Christ having left us no other Image of himself but the Sacrament, in which the Substance of Bread is the Image of his Body, we ought therefore to make no other Image of our Lord.* To avoid the force of this Argument, the Fathers of the following Nicene Council, who were for Images, did declare, That the Sacrament after Consecration, is not the Image or Antitype of Christ's Body and Blood, but is properly his Body and Blood. This was in or about the year 788. which Doctrine being first broached on this occasion, one *Paschasius* Abbot of Corbey about the year 818, did much propagate and advance it in the Latin Church; tho' not

without

about vigorous opposition; first by *Rabanus Maurus*, Bishop of *Mentz*, one of the most Learned men of that Age; and afterwards by *Berengarius*, *Bertram* and others: But the Doctrine making much for the Honour of Priesthood, was greedily embraced by most of the Clergy, and poor *Berengarius* forc'd to Recant, first in a Council held at *Rome*, by Pope *Nicholas* the Second, and afterwards again under Pope *Gregory* the Seventh, in or about the year 1079. And to declare, That the Bread and Wine are substantially changed into the true and proper Body of Christ; and after Consecration, are the true Body which was born of the Virgin, and which did hang on the Cross. But tho they had invented the thing, I do not find they had yet got a name for it till the Council of *Lateran*, under Pope *Innocent* the Third, in the year 1215. became its God-Father, and call'd it *Transubstantiation*; so that from the first starting, to the compleating of the opinion, and establishing it for an Article of Faith, was above 400 years, and that too the most wretched time for Blindness and Ignorance that ever the Church laboured under, and no wonder if whilst Christians were generally asleep, the evil one took advantage to sow his Tares; for in this dark period it was that not only this, but most other Popish Errors, (as *Imaginis*, *Purgatory*, *Indulgences*, *Auricular Confession*, &c.) received, if not their Rise, yet their main growth and reputation in the world.

Q. But the *Romanists* affirm this Doctrine of theirs is founded on the plain positive words of our Lord and Saviour, *This is my Body*.

A. First, If they will abide by the strict Literal words, they make nothing for their *Transubstantiation*; for he that says, *This is my Body*, does not say, *This is Transubstantiated into my Body*; for if in any usual Intelligible sense it may be his body without this notion of *Transubstantiation*, then cannot *Transubstantiation* be from thence inferred. Now the sense will be very usual and intelligible if the words be

taken *Figuratively*, as much as to say, This bread *signifies* or *represents*, or *exhibits* my Body; for such *Figurative Expressions* are frequent in Scripture, as Christ is called a *Rock*, 1 Cor. 10. 4. a *Door*, Joh. 10. 9. a *true Vine*, Joh. 15. 1. Believers are said to be all *one Bread*, 1 Cor. 10. 17. and Chap. 12. 27. *Ye are the Body of Christ*. Will any man argue from these Texts, that our Saviour was substantially a *Rock*, or a *Vine*, or that the *Corinthians* were substantially *incorporated* into the *Body of Christ*? If not, why will we strain this one Text to a sense alike absurd? especially since this *Figurative* way of speaking is the rather to be expected in the Institution of a *Sacrament*, the very nature of which is to represent and exhibit some invisible Grace and benefit, by an outward sign and *figure*. Nor can it be denied but Christ in the Institution of this very Sacrament useth *Figurative Expressions*, which cannot be taken literally and literally, as, *This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood*, &c. It is impossible that the Disciples should understand these words of our Saviour *literally*, because they not only *saw*, that what he gave them, was *Bread and Wine*; but saw likewise as plainly that it was not his Body which was given, but his Body which gave them that which was given; not his Body *broken*, and his Blood *shed*, because they saw him *alive* at that very time, and beheld his Body *whole* and *unpierced*, therefore they must needs understand them as we do, *Sacramentally*.

Secondly, St. Paul divers times calls it *Bread*, even after the Consecration, 1 Cor. 11. *As oft as ye eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, ye do shew forth the Lords Death till he come. Whosoever shall eat this Bread, and drink this Cup of the Lord unworthily, &c.*

Thirdly, Christ's Body remains in Heaven, and therefore is not here on Earth.— *Christ sits at the right hand of God*, Col. 3. 1. *Whom the heavens must contain till the resurrection of all things*, Acts 3. 21.

Fourthly, The Primitive Church knew nothing of this; the Fathers mention it not, nay, rather explode any such conceits; nothing can be more express, than that saying of St. *Augustine* in his Book *De Doctrinâ Christianâ*, where delivering several Rules for the right understanding of Scripture, he gives this for one; — ‘If any Sentence of Scripture seems to command any heinous Wickedness or Crime; it is *Figurative*; for Example, Except ye eat the flesh of the son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you; this seems to command an heinous Wickedness and Crime, therefore it is *Figurative*; commanding us to communicate of the Passion of our Lord, and with delight and advantage to lay up in our Memory, that his *Flesh* was crucified and wounded for us.

Fifthly, It includes monstrous *Absurdities*, as that Christ held his whole Body in his hands, yea, did eat himself, whilst he sat whole and intire with his Disciples at the Table; that his Body must be in a thousand places at once; and his whole Body be much less than the least Limb of his Body, &c.

Sixthly, It subverts the whole *Credibility* of the Christian Religion; for that is mainly built on the *Miracles* wrought by our Saviour and his Apostles, which depended on the *Senses* of those that saw them; but if our Senses may not be credited touching their proper Objects, but I must believe what my *Eyes*, *Tast*, *Feeling*, informs me to be a *Wafer* or *Wine*, to be really substantially *Flesh* and *Blood*, where is the certainty of any *Miracle*? for a *Miracle* is only a supernatural effect, evident to the Sense.

Seventhly, It introduces *Idolatry*, for the *Romanists* adore and give Divine worship to the Sacrament, and require the same of all who have Communion with them; now if this Opinion of *Transubstantiation* be not true, (as we have shew'd it to be *false*) 'tis plain, and themselves cannot deny, but they are guilty of gross *Idolatry*; nor will it

it excuse them, to say, They worship not the *Bread*, but the *Christ*, suppling the *Bread* to be *Christ*; for those that worshipped the *Sun* or *Jupiter*, did suppose them to be *Gods*; and if such a Plea were good, all Idolatry should be excused; but the Apostle teaches otherwise. When you hear, *not Gods, ye did service to them which by nature are no gods*, Gal. 4. 8.

Q. What do the *Romanists* mean by the *Sacrifice* of the *Mass*?

A. Their common Doctrine is, That at the *Sacrament* of the *Lords Supper* (which they call the *Mass*) there is a *new sacrifice* offered by the Priest, which is *Propitiatory* both for the *Quick* and the *Dead* (viz. such as are in *Purgatory*); that is, tends to procure the *Expiation* of their *Sins*, or at least the *Punishment* due to them, and this they call an *unbloody Sacrifice*, to distinguish it from that which our blessed Saviour offered on the *Cross*, when he shed his *Blood* for us; but how it can be *unbloody*, whilst the natural Substance of the *Blood* is there, according to their Principles, is not easy to understand. Nor yet, how it can truly be called a *Commemoration* of his *Death*, which they say is a *Sacrifice* of *Christ*, who is then *corporeally* Present.

Q. Is this Tenet agreeable to Scripture?

A. No, but directly contrary, and highly injurious to that All-sufficient *Sacrifice* of *Christ*; who was once offered to bear the *sin* of many, Heb. 9. 28. *Christ* after he had offered *one Sacrifice* for *Sin*, sat down at the right hand of *God*, Heb. 10. 12. By *one offering*, *Christ* hath perfected for ever them that are *sanctified*, Heb. 10. 14. *Christ* hath once suffered for *sin*; that he might bring us to *God*, Rom. 6. 10. Where *Remission* of *Sin* is, there is *no more offering* for *sin*, Heb. 10. 18. Either the *Remission* was not obtained by *Christ's* *once offering*; or there must be *no more offering*; that is, *Christ's* offering upon the *Cross*, was *insufficient*, or the

the Romanists in the Mass (to say no more of it) *unlawful*
 Is it lawful to exclude Christian People from receiving the Sacrament of the Lords Supper in such Kind? Or to give but half the Sacrament, viz. the Bread, but not the Cup of the Lord? *No*, it is unlawfully for Christ instituted it in both Kinds, with a Command to keep up the Celebration thereof till his second Coming; *Matth. 26. 27.* He took the Cup, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it, and delivers this Legacy and Command with a strong Reason, For this is my blood of the new Testament, which is shed for many; for the remission of sins; so *Mark 14. 23.* He took the Cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, saying, All drink of it. And 'tis remarkable, that he doth not say, But you all, (tho they were to do so) but Drink ye all, as foreseeing the sacrilegious Attempts of taking away from the People.

2. The Apostles only were present, and they were *not* to be refused.

3. *First*, 'Tis evident that eating and drinking belong to the same Persons, and if one be restrained, so is the other; and since 'tis confessed that Eating belongs to the People, by Virtue of this Precept, (eat of this) by the same Reason, doth Drinking belong to them, by Virtue of that Precept, (drink all of it).

4. *Secondly*, Tho the Apostles were Ministers, yet in this they were in the Peoples stead, and Christ was the Minister, or Dispenser of this Sacrament, and as they were Ministers, he commanded them, (Do this in remembrance of me) that is, take and distribute Bread and Wine to the People, as He had to them. And if they had commanded to give the Bread to the People, they are commanded to give the Wine also.

5. *Thirdly*, St. Paul clearly expounds this, and applies it to all Believers; for having recited our Lords words, thus he

he writes to all the *Corinthians*, *Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup*, 1 Cor. xi. where in *four Verses*, he inseparably joins *Eating and Drinking together*. Remarkable are the words and prodigious the confidence of the Council of *Constance* (held 1417.) who first forbade the *Cup* to the *Laity*. — *Altho* (say they) *Christ did Minister this Sacrament under two Forms of Bread and Wine*, and altho in the *Primitive Church*, this *Sacrament* was received by the *Faithful* under both *Kinds*; yet we [for most trivial Reasons by them mentioned] *Decree that it shall be received under one Kind only*.

Q. I am weary of such a Church, as will take upon her plainly to *contradict Christ* in so great an *Ordinance*, and therefore shall release you of your present trouble, if you please only to give me a brief Answer to those two common Questions, *By what right did the Church of England separate from the Church of Rome? And where was your Church before that time?*

A. To the first I Answer, *First*, That the Gospel was preached in our *Britain* very early (well nigh as soon, as some say before it was at *Rome*), by *Apostolical Men*, and Churches planted here, over whom the Church of *Rome* had no Jurisdiction.

Secondly, That altho *Rome* did afterwards insinuate herself, and usurp Authority over our *English Church*, she had never any Right so to do.

Thirdly, That the Church of *Rome* in process of time becoming very corrupt in Doctrine and Practices, endeavoured to impose such Corruptions and Innovations upon all those of her Communion, which yet were from time to time opposed, and complained of, by many of her own Pious and Learned Members, and great numbers by her Cruelty put to death for such opposition.

Fairly, The Case being thus; and the Church of *Rome*, after all Admonitions and Intreaties, not only refusing to reform her self, but on the contrary, cutting off all hopes, by proclaiming her self *Infalible*, and to be not a part of, but the *whole Catholick Church*; the *Mistress* of all other Churches, &c. Hereupon the Church of *England*, with Sovereign Authority, and in an orderly manner, did cast off *Rome's* usurped Authority, and reform it self, reducing all Doctrines and Practices to the Holy Scripture, and Pattern of the pure Primitive Times; In doing which, she did but her Duty, and was far from being guilty of any *Schism*, for that is a *Causeless Separation*, whereas here were important and sufficient Reasons; nor did she depart from the *Catholick Church* (being her self a considerable part of it) but only from the depraved Opinions and Practices of the Church of *Rome*; who is notoriously guilty of *Schism*, that is, of a groundless sinful Separation from other Faithful Christians, whilst she makes such *unlawful Terms* of Communion, that no Man well informed, can with a good Conscience comply with; And whilst she sets up her self above all other Churches, and will hold Communion with none but those that will enslave themselves to her: By which means she broke off from the *Eastern Church*, which would not submit to this her Usurpation; and by the same means made it necessary for the *Western Churches* to withdraw from her, that they might not be defiled with her Errors and Corruptions, and to reform themselves so far as they had been defiled.

To the Second Question, you may answer your self out of what hath been said; The Protestants pretend not to bring in a *new Religion*, or erect a *new Church*, but to restore the true *Ancient Religion* of Christ, and vindicate it from the Rubbish which ill Men had cast upon it, and to reform it to the Primitive Constitution; so that (as one says well) to ask, *Where our Religion was before Luther?*

Luther is as impertinent, as to ask a Husbandman, how his Corn was before it was needed. Our Religion was before *Luther*, in Christ and the Apostles, and in all Saints and Holy Churches; It was afterwards (though not so conspicuous) yet really existent in all those that held the true Ancient, Catholic Doctrine; and so far in the Roman Church it self, but more eminently in all the good Christians, who both retained the Foundation, and also opposed *Rome's* Innovations, and prayed and fought for a Reformation; of whom (altho the same be not absolutely necessary, yet) our Learned Writers have given in Catalogues, and vouched Testimonies in every Age. I will only give you one Instance; The *Waldenses*, called in contempt by their Adversaries, the poor men of Lyons, or *Leonists* (of whom Histories inform us, that *Furcius St. Dominick*, in the 13th Century, with his Zeal, butchered several hundred thousands) held the same Doctrine in the main Points with us, as we may justify by their Confessions yet extant. Now *Rainerius* himself, their cruel Inquisitor, who made Bonfires of them, and who flourished about the Year of our Lord 1254, gives the Account of these People; *The Leonists* (saith he) are the most pernicious of all Sects that are, or ever have been; and the cause for these three Causes.

First, Because they have been of the longest standing; for some say, they have continued ever since Pope Sylvester, others say from the time of the Apostles.

Secondly, Because it is more general than any Sect, for there is no Land in which they are not.

Thirdly, That whereas all other Sects, by the horridness of their Blasphemies against God, strike horror into those that hear them: This Sect of the Leonists hath the face of Piety, in that they lead a righteous life; and believe all things well of God, only they blaspheme the Church of Rome. [*Rainerius contra Waldenses, Cap. 1.*]

Q. Certainly a notable Testimony, especially proceeding from a professed Enemy! — I thank you heartily, for the Satisfaction you have given me.

A. If you desire further Information, consult the Works of our Learned Protestant Writers, Ancient and Modern; particularly the Treatises of several able *Divines* yet living, who have lately with great Clearness, and exact Judgment discoursed of the Principal Points in Controversy.

To whose worthy Pains, — I beseech God to give a Blessing, and to inspire all that call upon his holy Name, with a *Love* and *Zeal* for his Truth, a due Reverence for his *Sacred Word* and Ordinances, a Spirit of *Charity* and *Obedience*, that so persisting in true Faith and Piety, they may advance his Glory, adorn the Religion they profess, and finally obtain the Salvation of their Immortal Souls. *Amen.*

F I N I S.
